

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1402125



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA 91711

C. F. GROBECKER.

London

28. Mar.

PAPERS
ON THE
Doctrine of the English Church
CONCERNING
THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE

WORKS BY THE REV. N. DIMOCK.

MEMORIAL EDITION.

With an Introductory Note by the BISHOP OF DURHAM.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS IN RELATION TO THE DOCTRINES OF GRACE, AS CONTAINED IN THE SCRIPTURES, TAUGHT IN OUR FORMULARIES, AND UPHELD BY OUR REFORMERS. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

CHRISTIAN UNITY: Some Considerations on the Subject. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER: Two Lectures. With an Appendix on the Augmentation Theory. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

OUR ONE PRIEST ON HIGH; or, the Present Sacerdotal Function of Christ in Heaven: What it is not, and What it is. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER IN ITS BEARING ON PRESENT EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSIES. With a Preface Touching on the Ancillary Evidence of Contemporary Writings and Doings. Crown 8vo, 2s. net.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SACERDOTIUM, AS CONTAINED IN THE SCRIPTURES AND TAUGHT IN OUR FORMULARIES. Crown 8vo, 2s. net.

RITUAL: ITS USE AND MISUSE; AND THREE PAPERS ON PATRISTIC AND MEDIÆVAL LITERATURE. 2s. net.

THE SACERDOTIUM OF CHRIST AS TAUGHT IN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, CONSIDERED ESPECIALLY IN RELATION TO THE BLOOD OF THE NEW COVENANT. 2s. net.

PAPERS ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH CONCERNING THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE. Crown 8vo. 2 vols. 5s. net.

ON EUCHARISTIC WORSHIP IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH. Containing some Historical Notice of the Origin and Development of the Doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, and of the Worship to which it has given rise. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA.

PAPERS
ON THE
Doctríne of the English Church
CONCERNING THE
EUCCHARISTIC PRESENCE

BX
5149
C5
D56
1911
v.2

BY THE
REV. N. DIMOCK, M.A.

MEMORIAL EDITION
WITH AN INTRODUCTORY NOTE BY
THE RT. REV. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D.
BISHOP OF DURHAM

IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. II,

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA

1911

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

"Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church concerning the Eucharistic Presence." Originally published in pamphlet form by William Macintosh.
Collected and published in two volumes, "Memorial Edition," by Longmans, Green & Co., 1911.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

No. VII.

	PAGE
THE ORDER OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER	283

APPENDIX I.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTE A	313	NOTE U	356
NOTE B	314	NOTE V	358
NOTE C	318	NOTE W	364
NOTE D	321	NOTE X	366
NOTE E	323	NOTE Y	367
NOTE F	324	NOTE Z	368
NOTE G	326	NOTE AA	370
NOTE H	328	NOTE BB	373
NOTE I	332	NOTE CC	375
NOTE K	334	NOTE DD	376
NOTE L	335	NOTE EE	378
NOTE M	336	NOTE FF	382
NOTE N	340	NOTE GG	385
NOTE O	340	NOTE HH	389
NOTE P	343	NOTE II	391
NOTE Q	347	NOTE KK	397
NOTE R	350	NOTE LL	399
NOTE S	351	NOTE MM	401
NOTE T	351	NOTE NN	402

No. VIII.

	PAGE
THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES	404

APPENDIX II.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTE A	461	NOTE D	486
NOTE B	468	NOTE E	505
NOTE C	472	NOTE F	512

THE REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE	519
a. QUESTIONS SUGGESTED BY THE HISTORICAL NOTICE	520
b. QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE USE OF THE PHRASE "UNDER THE FORM OF BREAD AND WINE"	525
c. QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TEACHING OF THE 29TH ARTICLE	525
d. QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE AUTHORITY OF HOOKER	526
e. QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TEACHING OF THE 28TH ARTICLE	530
f. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO SACRIFICIAL LANGUAGE	531
g. QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE BLACK RUBRIC	531
h. QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TEACHING OF THE CATECHISM	532
i. QUESTIONS AS TO THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH DIVINES	533

APPENDIX III.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTE A	539	NOTE C	548
NOTE B	543		
INDEX OF AUTHORS AND BOOKS QUOTED AND REFERRED TO	553		
INDEX OF SUBJECTS	579		

No. VII.

THE ORDER OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

IN proceeding now to the consideration of our Communion Service, let me begin by asking of my readers some allowance for the difficulties I feel, in so setting forth my own views in relation to the opinions and arguments of those who differ from me, as to do justice to my own convictions, and at the same time to do no injustice to the views, and no injury to the feelings of those who maintain the Real Objective Presence. If sometimes I shall fail to overcome these difficulties, I trust the failure will not be set down to any desire to offend,

Generals do not concentrate their forces on sandhills, nor build fortifications on mud banks, if there is a strong height within easy reach.

It argues ill for the possession of strong points and great points, when men plant their strength on what is weak and small.

Let it not seem to be said unkindly, when I say, that it cannot but strike one, as arguing forcibly against any real strength in their position, that in dealing with the service for the Holy Communion, the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence, are found to build their arguments so much upon what may fairly be called small matters, some of them mere minutiae and grammatical niceties.

When we enter on an examination of this service, surely we are entering on that which should yield us at once, abundantly and unmistakably, the teaching of our Church's doctrines on the subject of the Eucharist.

Surely great truths, truths to be taught and held as *de fide*, should not here be left to be laboriously spun out of thin threads, the spider's webs of minute verbal and grammatical criticisms.

Those, whose views I am here opposing, must allow me

to say, not at all, I trust, in anything like a spirit of triumph over what appears to me their weakness, but simply in a desire to bring the true state of the case (as it seems to me) clearly and forcibly before my readers, that such an examination of the service as these criticisms rise out of, seems almost like the microscopical examination of some palimpsest manuscript, in which curious eyes desire to decipher¹ some characters of the older and obliterated writing, discernible yet under the plain and obvious marking of a more recent hand. Or perhaps, in some cases, it may be more like the straining of the eyes to discover whether our Reformers, after ruling their lines straight, have always exactly kept to those lines: whether a very minute and searching investigation may not discover some small strokes, perhaps a little too high, or some turns a little too low, while the broad and clear characters which meet the naked eye, are seen all following their line too plainly, and marking their sense too clearly and distinctly to admit of a question.

To aim at answering all such criticisms as these, appears to me to be giving them an undue importance.²

Nevertheless, since it is not pleasant to have shown to us, by an oxy-hydrogen microscope, black monsters in a drop of water, and then to be told that this water is what we are drinking every day, it may be worth while to take one or two examples, by which it may be seen, that as sometimes dark shadows may be cast from some fault in the lens, instead of from some terrible pollution in the liquid, so some of these microscopical revelations of what we should regard as false teaching in our Prayer Book, may be found after all to have in them nothing so very formidable.

(1) One such example,³ and it appears to be thought to involve a most serious difficulty for us, is found in the first exhortation, where it is said that "God hath given His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ . . . to be our spiritual food and sustenance *in that holy Sacrament, which*, being so divine . . . to them who receive it worthily, and so dangerous to them that presume to receive *it* unworthily, etc." Here a dilemma is before us. The antecedent of "*which*," must be "holy Sacrament." We are to choose our sense of "holy

¹ See Appendix, Note A.

² See Appendix, Note B.

³ See Sequel to Kiss of Peace, p. 336, sqq.; also Grueber's Answer to Dr. Heurtley, pp. 15, 16; and Letter to Archbishop of Canterbury, 1856, pp. 17, 18, 33, 34; and Second Letter, pp. 24, 25; and Bishop Forbes on Articles, vol. ii., p. 577.

Sacrament." Does its sense here include the *res Sacramenti*? If we answer "No," then we are told that our Saviour Jesus Christ, our food and sustenance, must be "in the elements." If we answer "Yes," then we must acknowledge that some presume to receive, and do receive, the "*res Sacramenti*," *i.e.*, the body and blood of Christ unworthily. Choose which we will, we are to find ourselves brought to the acknowledgment, somehow, of the "Real Objective Presence."

But is it anything very strange or unnatural to understand "that holy Sacrament" to signify the whole ordinance?¹ And if not, where then is there any shadow of a difficulty remaining?

(2) Another example is set before us as presenting a very serious difficulty indeed.

The difficulty is in the very words of administration. "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."

It is expressed in the following words taken from "Fragments, by Edward Husband, Priest of the Church of England."² (Palmer.) "If then the BREAD is not the BLESSED BODY . . . I am guilty of a FALSEHOOD every time I use those words, and knowingly DECEIVE the hearts of the Faithful by declaring It to be what It is not. . . . But what will you say of us, the Priests of the Most High God, if we at Holy Communion offer you That which we certify by our words, to be 'the body and blood' of the Lord, and all the time ourselves believe It to be nothing more or less than earthly bread and wine, to be received in remembrance of an absent Christ? Why, I think you would say, 'Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?'

"Oh! sooner far than uttering these 'words of administration' without believing in what they say, in our own souls, let us resign our position altogether, and seek some place where we should not SEAR *our conscience*, by UTTERING *with our lips* what we do NOT *believe* in our hearts!" (Pages 11, 12.)

I must profess myself unable³ to see WHERE in the words

¹ See Appendix, Note C.

² See Appendix, Note D.

³ "For the other exceptions, there is very little in them, whether the minister lay his hand on the sacred elements when he repeats the words of institution, as at the time, or only consecrates them by the prayers of the Church and the words of Christ, without any other ceremony as heretofore: whether with the Church of Rome we use only the words of Christ in the distribution; or with most of the Reformed Churches the other expression, 'Take, and eat this,' etc., or (as we choose

alluded to, is to be found that which Mr. Husband considers must be such an insuperable difficulty to us.

But I rather think, wherever the difficulty may be supposed to lie, the argument of Mr. Husband will be sufficiently met by asking *ONE question*. What would Mr. Husband have thought of our bondage, if instead of having on our souls the burden which the Church of England has laid on us, we had in its place the yoke which would have been imposed by the Westminster Assembly, who in their Directory,¹ appoint the minister to "break the bread and give it to the communicants," saying, "Take ye, eat ye,² THIS IS THE BODY OF CHRIST which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Him."³

Apply the same rule to the words of distribution, and if it might make the Church of England seem to be Lutheran, the Puritan divines might be judged to be Papists.

(3) One more example (and it is alleged as one of great force) shall be taken.

The argument is derived from the words of the Prayer of Humble Access:—"Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, *so* to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ and to drink His blood, *that* our sinful bodies," etc.

It is alleged that, as a necessary consequence of the words of this prayer, it *must be possible so*⁴ to eat the flesh of Christ and to drink His blood, as that our sinful bodies may NOT be made clean by His body, nor our souls washed in His most precious blood. If so, then it must be possible to receive the *res sacramenti* unworthily. And to say that the unworthy receive the "*res sacramenti*," is to make a presence "objective" in the elements, and independent of faith in the heart.

rather) join them both together: whether we sing the *Gloria in Excelsis Deo* before or after receiving." (Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 79.)

¹ See Appendix, Note E.

² So the Puritan Prayer Book of 1574 or 1575, which takes the name of Middleburgh (where a company of English merchants resided under the ministry of Cartwright, and where subsequent editions were published), directs the minister "to break the bread and deliver it to the people, saying, Take and eat: *this bread is the body* of Christ that was broken for us." (See Blakeney's Common Prayer, p. 195; and Hall's Fragmenta Liturgica, vol. i., pp. 9 and 65; and Reliquiæ Liturgicæ, vol. i., p. 59; also, Bancroft's "Dangerous Positions," pp. 95-97, London, 1591.) And Baxter's Service gives these for the words of administration:—"Take ye, eat ye; *this is the body* of Christ, which is broken for you. Do this in remembrance of Him." (See Blakeney's Common Prayer, p. 202; and Hall's Reliquiæ Liturgicæ, vol. iv., p. 72.)

³ See Appendix, Note F.

⁴ See Archdeacon Denison, "Three Sermons," p. 71; J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, p. 186, note; Sequel to Kiss of Peace, p. 345; etc.

But surely there is no real difficulty in understanding the prayer to imply *sacramental* (not *real*) eating *only* in the case of unbeneficial reception. The prayer might not unnaturally be paraphrased thus:—¹ “Grant us to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son, not sacramentally only, receiving in our mouths the shadow and sign alone, to our condemnation, but so really and in very truth, receiving by our faith and feeding in our hearts upon the very Thing signified,”² etc.

In order, however, completely to invalidate all the force of this argument, it will be sufficient, I think, to call attention to the fact, that the separation in a sentence of “*so*” from “*THAT*” does *by no means* OF NECESSITY, in the language of our Prayer Book (as is commonly the case in modern use), put that emphasis on the “*so*” which implies that the same thing *might be*, with different results.

For proof of this, let the reader be asked to mark carefully the use of the same form of expression in other parts of the Prayer Book. He will find, I think, that if, in the prayer before us, it is held, to prove that (according to the teaching of our Service) it must be possible to receive the *res sacramenti* unworthily; then, by the application of the very same argument, our Prayer Book must be held to teach plainly that it must be possible—

(1) that our Heavenly Father may *so* assist us by His grace, that we may NOT “continue in that holy fellowship.”

(2) that the ministers and stewards of Christ’s mysteries may *so* prepare Christ’s way, by turning the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, that at His second coming we may NOT be found an acceptable people in His sight.

(3) that we may be *so* joined together in unity of spirit by the doctrine of Apostles and Prophets, as NOT to be made an holy temple acceptable unto God.

(4) that we may *so* follow God’s blessed saints in all virtuous and godly living, that we may NOT come to the joys which God hath prepared for them that unfeignedly love Him.

(5) that we may *so* faithfully serve God in this life, that we MAY *fail* to attain His everlasting promise.

¹ Compare the words of Cranmer quoted below (p. 345), “that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same, that we may be partakers of Christ’s body and blood, and that therewith in spirit and in truth we may be spiritually nourished.” (On Lord’s Supper, p. 79.)

See also especially the passage from the Homily, quoted in Appendix, p. 328.

² See Appendix, Note G.

(6) that God would *so* vouchsafe to send His blessing on His servants, that they may NOT obey His will, nor abide in His love.

(7) that God would *so* turn His anger from us and make haste to help us, that we may NOT live with Him in the world to come.

(8) that we may *so* be led in the knowledge and obedience of God's Word, that in the end we may NOT obtain everlasting life.

These examples (viewed, NOT *separately*, but ALL *together*) will suffice, I think, to show that, whether we like to regard the word "*so*" as emphatic or not (in this prayer) any argument as to doctrine built on so weak a foundation must fall to the ground.

I have spoken of such arguments as microscopical arguments. I trust in speaking thus, and in using such illustrations as I have used, I may not seem to have been treating the matter in a way unseemly or unbecoming. It is with no desire to treat the arguments of the Ritualists contemptuously that I have resorted to them. If any apology is considered due for what I have said, or the way I have said it, I trust such apology will be accepted with an assurance that I am very far from wishing to treat any of these arguments or their maintainers with levity or with any want of due courtesy. I gladly bear testimony to the ability with which those arguments have been supported, and the zeal which has been manifested in their defence. But still the truth is the truth. And some such illustrations appear to me best capable of bringing out clearly into view what I cannot but regard as the truth in this matter. To some extent I shall be obliged myself to use the microscope in this paper. Possibly, to some minds really desirous to look at these things fairly, and to weigh them according to their true weight, some of these matters may seem to be more important than they have appeared to me, and I may be thought to have been making them too small, and treating them too lightly.¹ Possibly I may have erred in that direction, though I hope I have not desired to do so. But the point I wish to press is this,—that for a true view of the testimony borne by this service to the matter before us, we are called upon primarily

¹ On this account, I have given in *the notes*, an amount of attention to them, far beyond what, in my own judgment, is due to them.

to look round on the service "in the length and the breadth of it." It must be allowed by all, I think, that such arguments as these are *comparatively* insignificant.

We have the broad field before us of our Church's "Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper." Surely here we should be as "in a land flowing with milk and honey." And then we are constrained to ask—Are we to be set to look for that which is regarded as the milk and honey hidden sparsely in such recondite recesses as these?

No. But we will stand and look round, and ask our readers to look round with us on the broad surface before us.

Let it not be taken amiss, if I venture to express a conviction that this controversy only needs to be driven out of holes and corners, and brought well out into the open.

Let us cease, then, from analysing phrases and expressions which surely were never meant to be analysed thus. Let us take a comprehensive view of the Service in its grand features and its bold outline. And looking round, let us ask—*Where*, here, are we to find this all-important teaching (in the view of some) of a real presence in the elements and of an oral reception? Where is the teaching of reception by unbelievers? Where is the doctrine of a sacrifice of Christ's present body and blood offered up in the elements, and so pleaded before the Father by the priest? Where is the teaching of a presence to be adored under the forms of bread and wine?

Where are these teachings? these doctrines which we are to hold as *de fide*?

Truly, if they are to be found anywhere, they must be found "under the microscope."

And what then about this absence—this absence of all that should give to our Service the character and impress of the "Real Objective Presence"?

Surely we may do right to enquire about it, and take note of the answer we receive—that this absence came of a CLEARING, and that the *date* of this CLEARING was the *date* of the REFORMATION, and that the *work* of this CLEARING was the *work* of the REFORMERS.

And shall we not do well also to note, what the history of our Church will tell us—that for such-like CLEARING work many perished at the stake, and gave their bodies to be burned, rather than put a hand to build up what thus they had destroyed?

Yes. But we must do more. We must mark well that this CLEARING work of our Reformers was not directed only to the

removal of the superstitions which clung to *transubstantiation*. Their axes and saws were not used only on such strong boughs of Popery as this. They were not satisfied with cutting down the topmost branches of the trees. No. That which, in the sight of those who hold the Real Objective Presence, should be as the milk and honey of the goodly land, in the eyes of our Reformers was all as gall and wormwood. And their mattocks and pick-axes were at work *under ground*. They were resolved, if possible, to leave NO ROOT that should bear such gall and wormwood.

And the history of the *clearing* which our Communion Service has seen, is the history of an *uprooting*. It is the history of a work carried on in the spirit of him whom God appointed as the foreman in the work, and who took up his tools crying to his fellows—"The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like topping and lopping of a tree, or cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground; but the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the REAL PRESENCE of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it), and of the SACRIFICE and oblation of Christ *made by the priest*, for the salvation of the quick and the dead. Which roots, if they be suffered to grow in the Lord's vineyard, they will overspread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions. These injuries to Christ be so intolerable, that no Christian heart can willingly bear them."¹

It was with such words as ² these, and in such a spirit as this, that Archbishop Cranmer set to "his hand and his axe with the rest" at the great CLEARING work which was before them.

And the result of such a determination, such a settled purpose to leave *no root* that might spring up and bear the gall and wormwood of a "Real Objective Presence" and its concomitant doctrines, is seen in the matters of difference between the first and second Prayer-books of Edward the Sixth. The first Prayer-book indeed was quite capable of being used without offence. In it all that could be said even to look like transubstantiation has been lopped off, the sacrificial character was maimed, and the adoration was gone,³ and there was nothing

¹ See Paper No. I., p. II.

² See Appendix, Note H.

³ See Appendix, Note I.

on the surface that must needs have seemed evil, if only it were interpreted according to the sense of the Articles subsequently published.¹ But like the phrase in the Notice at the end of the first book of Homilies, there was something in it which might seem at least to have something of a *sound*, or perhaps something of *flavour* of a "Real Presence" in a Lutheran sense. There were *ROOTS*. And before the spirit which animated Cranmer and his associates, the roots must be rooted up. They could not rest satisfied till they had applied axe and hand to a more thorough *CLEARING*. These causes of offence must be removed. In that new *CLEARING* there must be a more thorough *uprooting*.² And axes and hands went to work again, not indeed, with intemperate precipitancy, not with fanatical disregard of ancient landmarks, not without the wisdom and prudence and caution of well-learned and able Divines:³—not at all in the spirit of those, who, for no sufficient cause, would prefer that which comes new⁴ from their own pen to those sacred and time honoured heritages of the Christian Church,⁵ which having been received from the times of purer faith, might well be cleansed from the superstitions and corruptions with which after ages had encrusted them; but still, not the less, yea rather all the more, and all the more notably, with steadfast and deliberate resolution, they went to work; with earnest and settled purpose to clear away whatever remained in our Communion Service, that might give reasonable cause for offence, or occasion for the planting and growing and spreading of superstitious practices or dangerous doctrines. And as the result we have now an order for the administration of the Lord's Supper, in which it requires a microscope to discover the root of a weed left behind.

No doubt it may be alleged (and few I imagine will dispute it) that in Cranmer's mild and gentle disposition there was that, the tendency of which was sometimes to make his policy seem feeble rather than firm, hesitating rather than decided, slow and cautious rather than vigorous.⁶

No doubt it may be urged that there were those at the time (and there have been some such ever since), who were dissatis-

¹ See Appendix, Note K.

² See Appendix, Note L.

³ See Hook's "Lives of Archbishops". Series ii., vol. ii., pp. 225, 226, 268, sqq.

⁴ See Appendix, Note M.

⁵ "Sudden changes without substantial necessary causes, and the heady setting forth of extremities, we did never love." (Ridley, as quoted by Dean Hook in "The Church and the Age," p. 29.)

⁶ See Hallam's "Constitutional History," vol. i., p. 99. Edit. 1867.

fied with the result, and regarded Cranmer and his associates as being even weak and half-hearted in their work of Reformation. But was Cranmer ever accused by such, of leaving in our Liturgy any roots of the doctrine of the Real Corporal Presence? If not; does not the very slowness and caution and moderation of the Reformers of our Liturgy make all the more evident and conspicuous the purpose and resolution which, in this matter at least, made their action to be vigorous, and their work to be thorough? In this particular, certainly, Cranmer's convictions were strong, and his hand was not feeble, and his purpose was steadfast, and his spirit was resolute, and his mind knew no indecision.

Cranmer and his associates may have been slow in casting off the faith of a Corporal Presence. But, having after much consideration, deliberately repudiated it at last, they were thoroughly and heartily in earnest in the work of uprooting it.

Cranmer was not always¹ irresolute. And of the doctrine of the Eucharist, it may be said—Here his strength lay. In this matter, when (after the most careful investigation) his long cherished views of the Presence had quite given way; when he had made up his mind, and put on his armour; then he came forth as a champion, with an invincible energy and power and determination, such as could not but win the admiration, even of some who had been disposed to mistrust him. And then with no hesitating and wavering mind, with no faint and feeble purpose (we may be sure) he took his place²—the foremost place—among those who, with minds not less earnest in the work than his own, sat down to revise and make perfect the Communion Service of the Church of England.³

If, in arranging the Liturgy of the English Church, our Reformers had acted as men having received as their orders "Cut away everything; spare nothing," then would the clearing process have afforded no special historical argument as to the repudiation of any particular doctrine.

¹ See Hook's Lives; Series ii., vol. ii., pp. 23, 24, 88, 174, 303, 304, 363, 376.

² No doubt there may have been on the commission men with tempers, on the whole, less conservative than Cranmer's; and it is quite possible that Cranmer may have exercised, to some extent, a restraining influence. But I can hardly conceive it possible, that any unprejudiced mind, acquainted with Cranmer's writings, can doubt for a moment, that Cranmer's own mind was fully and thoroughly in accord with, and went heartily and earnestly to work with, the *animus* which resolved on, initiated, guided, and effected the changes in Edward's second Book. (See Cardwell's "Two Liturgies," Preface, pp. 29, 30, 35.) And the same, I feel persuaded, would be true of Ridley also.

³ See Appendix, Note N.

But, if, on the other hand, our Reformers have acted rather, as in obedience to such a command as this¹—"Spare where you may; reject nothing rashly; don't cut away without cause;" then the marked and consistent rejection of passages or expressions seeming to favour a particular doctrine, must be allowed to afford a historical argument of our Church's repudiation of that particular doctrine.

Again, if our present Liturgy had been the result of a single review of ancient offices, then we should not have had anything like so forcible an argument as we now have against the Real Corporal Presence; for it might have been said that all the changes resulted from a strong repugnance to the Romish doctrine of *transubstantiation only*. As it is, we know that whatever sounded of distinctively² Romish doctrine had been eliminated from Edward's first Book. It will hardly be maintained that there were any roots of transubstantiation left. But the changes in the second manifest a purpose too plain³ to be

¹ Let the reader mark how forcibly this principle, conservative of what is old, where it may be spared, is expressed in what is written (by the pen, probably, of Cranmer) at the commencement of the Prayer Book, under the heading "Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained." There it is said "Surely where the old may be well used, there they cannot reasonably reprove the old only for their age, without bewraying of their own folly. For in such a case they ought rather to have reverence unto them for their antiquity, if they will declare themselves to be more studious of unity and concord, than of innovations and new-fangledness, which (as much as may be with true setting forth of Christ's Religion) is always to be eschewed." And let it be marked also, how, along with this, there is the determination to abolish and not spare, when "the abuses could not well be taken away, the thing remaining still."

² Thus Soames says of Edward's *First Book*. "In fact, everything, properly denominated Romish, in the established liturgies, was unsparingly retrenched; and to the new work were transferred those features only of its immediate predecessor which are among the venerable remains of the ancient Latin Church. This enlightened policy proved the means of introducing to the nation a service remarkably resembling that established in Britain at a remote period. Indeed, upon the whole, nothing could be more judicious than the conduct of those entrusted with this delicate commission; for although the first service-book contained some concessions to Romish prejudices, afterwards properly denied, yet these were sanctioned by Early usage among Christians, and it justly seemed expedient to deal cautiously with popular prepossessions." (*History of Reformation*, vol. iii., pp. 369-371.)

³ Thus, concerning the *first Book*, Hilles had written to Bullinger, June, 1549: "We have an uniform celebration of the Eucharist throughout the whole kingdom, but after the manner of the Nuremberg Churches and some of those in Saxony . . . for the preservation of the public peace, they afford *no cause of offence to the Lutherans*." (Original Letters. P. S. Edit., p. 266.)

That there was a complete change in this respect in the Second Book, we have the testimony of Procter, who says "The *great doctrinal alteration* referred to the presence of Christ in the consecrated Elements of the Eucharist. In the book of 1549, the Communion Service had been so constructed as to be consistent with the belief of a real, and perhaps of a substantial and corporal presence. But the altera-

disputed, of expunging passages which might seem to give shelter—not for transubstantiation—but for the doctrine of the Real Corporal Presence.

Acting on principles which were conservative of what might be preserved, the highest and strongest principles of our Reformers were destructive of *this*. Sparing what might be spared, they knew nothing of listening to a voice which would bid them spare *this*.

Let those who question that the CLEARING process of the Reformation aimed at such an UPROOTING of the doctrine of the Real or Corporal Presence institute a comparison between the Prayer Book of 1549 and the Prayer Book of 1552,¹ and herein let them mark especially *three* things:—

1st. The Rejection of all forms of expression such as might seem to teach the communicants to seek for the Presence of Christ in the Consecrated Elements.

2nd. The entire removal of the Sacrificial Character from the Service.

3rdly. The important significance of the Change in the Prayer of consecration.

I. ² As to the first of these three things;—Four examples may be given. (1) In the Prayer Book of 1549 we have the words, “And to the end that we should alway remember the

tions in 1552 were such as to authorize and foster the belief that the consecrated elements had no new virtues imparted to them, and that Christ was present in the Eucharist in no other manner than as He is ever present to the prayers of the faithful. The pale of Church communion was thus *enlarged* for the more earnest reformers, but *closed against the slightest leaning* to Mediæval doctrine.” (On Common Prayer, pp. 33, 34, in part quoted from Cardwell’s *Conferences*, *Intro.*, p. 6. See also Archbishop Laurence in “*Doctrine of the Church of England on Baptism*,” p. 33; and Professor J. J. Blunt’s “*Reformation in England*,” p. 208; *Edit.* 1832.)

I venture to express an opinion that the Lutheran character of the *first* Book of Edward has sometimes been over-estimated. It would be far from the truth, I think, to say that in it was *taught* the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist. It would be a more correct statement to say that, *unexplained*, it might have been understood as making room for that doctrine, and affording some cover for those who taught it.

Bucer said of the *first* book—“*Egi gratias Deo, qui dedisset vos has ceremonias eo puritatis reformare, nec enim quicquam in illis deprehendi, quod non sit ex verbo Dei desumptum, aut saltem ei non adversetur, commode acceptum. Nam non desunt paucula quædam, quæ si quis non candide interpretetur, videri queant, non satis cum verbo Dei congruere.*” (*Scripta Anglicana*, Basil., 1557, p. 456.)

In the first Book of Edward, the repudiation of *Romish* doctrine is distinct, of *Lutheran* doctrine not distinct. Edward’s second book is the first book made *fully* perfect by such *explanations* of the doubtful expressions in the first as add distinctness to the repudiation of Lutheran doctrine also.

¹ See Appendix, Note O.

² See Appendix, Note P.

exceeding love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by His precious blood-shedding He hath obtained to us, He hath left in those holy mysteries, as a pledge of His love, and a continual remembrance of the same, His own blessed Body and precious Blood, for us to feed upon spiritually, to our endless comfort and consolation."

In 1552 this is changed. There is now no word of the body and blood of Christ being *left* to us "in those holy mysteries." But instead we are told "He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of His love and continual remembrance of His death, to our great and endless comfort." The change was not necessary, but it was clearly significant.

(2) Again. In a Prayer which in 1549 followed immediately on the Prayer of Consecration were the words "And here we offer and present unto Thee (O Lord) ourself, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee; humbly beseeching that whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction."

These words might indeed seem to imply such a Presence in the Elements that in receiving them, those who were partakers of this Holy Communion might *unworthily* receive Christ's body and blood. But in 1552 this root, out of which evil might grow, was removed, and instead the words were inserted, "Beseeching Thee, that all we who are partakers of this Holy Communion, may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction."

(3) Again the Prayer near the end of the Service commencing "Almighty and everliving God" is carried on in the Book of 1549 in these words, "we most heartily thank Thee, for that thou hast vouchsafed to feed us *in these holy mysteries*, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and hast assured us (duly receiving the same) of Thy favour and goodness towards us." The words might have been soundly interpreted. But very indicative of the *clearing axe*, and the steadfast purpose of the Reformers is the change in 1552 which gives us these words, "We most heartily thank Thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, which have *duly received these holy mysteries*,¹ with the spiritual

¹ See Appendix, Note Q.

food of the most precious body and blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ."

(4) Again in 1549, a Rubric at the end of the Service declares, "Men must not think less to be received in part, than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

In 1552 this rubric, which, unexplained, looked too much like a Corporal Presence in the Elements was uprooted and swept quite away.

These changes may, not one of them, perhaps, be regarded as highly important, viewed singly and separately. But their true significance is to be estimated by a view of them in conjunction, not only with one another, but with the other and far more important changes, which are yet to be noticed.

II. The second point to be observed is the Removal of the Sacrificial character from the Service. I mean of course the word "sacrificial" here to point to the meaning of "*sacrifice*" maintained by our opponents, as something entirely different from mere commemorative sacrifice, and the offering of ourselves, our souls and bodies, and the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

With reference to this point, it is to be observed that there was a very significant change in the very title of the service. In 1549 the title was "The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." Here indeed is an indication of a desire not to appropriate a name which in the ears of men in those days *sounded* of sacrifice. But in the Second Book the word is cleared away altogether, and the title stands, "The order for the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion."¹

So also the word "Altar" which was retained in 1549 is entirely removed from the Book of 1552. And on the significance of this change the following words may be taken as a comment:—

"When the same thing is signified, it may not be of much importance by what name it is called; but the distinction between an Altar and a Communion Table is in itself essential and deeply founded in the most important difference in matters of faith between Protestants and Romanists; namely, in the different notions of the nature of the Lord's Supper which prevailed in the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Refor-

¹ See Appendix, Note R.

mation, and those which were introduced by the Reformers. By the former it was considered as a sacrifice of the body and blood of the Saviour.¹ The Altar was the place on which the sacrifice was to be made; the elements were to be consecrated, and being so consecrated were treated as the actual body and blood of the victim. The Reformers, on the other hand, considered the Holy Communion not as a sacrifice but as a ² feast, to be celebrated at the Lord's Table." (Final Judgment in the case of "Liddell v. Weston," quoted in Principles at Stake, p. 164.)

But as to this removal of the sacrificial character from the Book of 1552, let me quote the words of another.³

"Mr. Stuart says: 'The Eucharistic sacrifice, then, consists in offering before God, as well as man, that memorial of the death of Christ which our Lord himself ordained.' He then refers to a passage in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.: 'We Thy humble servants do celebrate, and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make.' He then adds: 'This is, simply, that chief and central act of Christian worship, which in the Church of England we commonly call the Eucharistic Sacrifice,⁴ and which is still called amongst Roman Catholics, as it used to be called among ourselves, the Mass.'⁵ On this passage I desire to make a few remarks. In order to obtain even the semblance of evidence in favour of his view, he has to refer to the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. Mr. Stuart knows perfectly well, that we are no more bound by that passage than we are by the Roman Catholic Missal. The very fact that it was

¹ While the name "altar" remained, it was *explained* as referring to the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," (see Edward's Letter to Ridley, as given in Bulley's Variations, p. 147,) and therefore as giving no support to that sacrificial doctrine which belongs to the Real Objective Presence, and which our Church was well understood to have altogether rejected. "We cannot well grant that they, in their masking Mass offer any such sacrifice, for they boast that they offer *reale corpus et realem sanguinem*, as they term it. The holy father Irenæus doth write, that the thing that is offered, receiveth his dignity and worthiness of him that doth offer, and that the sacrifice is accepted of God, because he that offereth it is accepted of God. Upon this I make argument—Every person that doth offer is of more worthiness than the thing which he offereth. The priest doth offer the body of Christ: ergo, the priest is of more worthiness than the body of Christ. O blasphemy intolerable!" (Bishop Alley's Πτωχομυσείον. The Poor Man's Library, tom. i., p. 218 a; Edit. Day, 1565.)

² See Appendix, Note S.

³ The Rev. Joseph Bardsley, in "Truths for the Times" (Hunt), pp. 92-94.

⁴ See Appendix C to Charge of Bishop of St. David's, 1866; especially pp. 141-

144.

⁵ See Appendix, Note T.

expunged when the Prayer Book was revised (in 1552),¹ proves that the Reformers felt that its retention would at least seem to sanction a doctrine which involves blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.² I am astonished that Mr. Stuart should refer to the passage. The late Archdeacon Wilberforce,³ in his book on the Eucharist, distinctly acknowledges that the removal of this passage stripped our Communion Service of its sacrificial character. I need scarcely say he advocated the views held by Mr. Stuart and the advanced Ritualists. His words, which deserve special attention, are these: 'The Service was divested of its sacrificial character, and no longer bore witness, as in early times,⁴ to the great event which is transacted at the altar. This was done, both by mutilating the Prayer of Oblation, which had been retained in the Book of 1548, and by placing it after, instead of before, the Communion.'⁵ Here, then, is enough to damp the ardour, one would think, of the warmest advocate of the Mass,—to be bound to use a Service for the offering of the Holy Sacrifice, which is divested⁶ of its sacrificial character, and which no longer bears witness to the great event transacted at the altar. But here, again, the editor of the *Directorium Anglicanum* suggests a way of getting over what to ordinary minds would appear an insuperable difficulty; viz., by offering up a silent prayer after the words of consecration, during which

¹ Yet Mr. Orby Shipley regards the use of the word *Mass*, "with a national prefix," as "authorized to English Churchmen who require such authority, by the employment of the term in the First English Book of Common Prayer, A.D. 1549." (Preface to "Ritual of the Altar," pp. 14, 15, note.)

² See Appendix, Note U.

³ "About a year after the publication of King Edward's First Book, Archbishop Cranmer abandoned his belief in the Real Presence—a change which seems to have been very acceptable to the young king and his favourites. By virtue of the more than Papal power which he assumed, Edward soon superseded the Book which he had formerly sanctioned, and imposed his Second Book of 1552 upon the nation. By this means, as well as by the Forty-two Articles which were published the same year, and in like manner without any spiritual sanction, the Zuinglo-Calvinistic system took possession of our Churches. . . . The ruling party had adopted the Zuinglian theory, and supposed the holy Eucharist to be merely a commemorative feast. For if Christ's real presence be denied, the primitive doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice must be abandoned also; so that to have maintained a spiritual participation in the offering, would have been to keep up a practice which had lost its meaning. It was only consistent, therefore, to accommodate the usages of the Church to its new doctrines. The Service, consequently, was divested of its sacrificial character, and no longer bore witness, as in early times, to the great event which is transacted at the altar. This was done both by mutilating the Prayer of Oblation, which had been retained in the Book of 1548, and by placing it after, instead of before, the Communion." ("Wilberforce on Eucharist," pp. 438-440.)

⁴ See Appendix, Note V.

⁵ See Hickes's Treatises, vol. i., pp. 126, 127; Anglo-Cath. Lib. Edit.

⁶ See Appendix, Note W.

the priest is to repeat secretly the prayer of the Roman Catholic Missal, ¹ offering up the body and blood of the Saviour as a sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead.” ²

Let me conclude this portion of the subject by quoting very weighty words of Archbishop Longley, written shortly before his death:—

“Seeing, then, the complexion which the Reformers, with all these expressions of respect for the ancient doctors of the Church, have given to our Communion Service, it seems impossible to doubt that they had weighed well those passages of the Fathers which are generally adduced in favour of the sacrificial view, and had judged that the corrections and explanations to which I have alluded were the true key to their real opinions. Wherefore they treated the Holy Office throughout as merely the commemoration of the great Sacrifice, or if it is to be treated as a sacrifice ³ in itself only as a spiritual sacrifice or act of worship, without any reference to the offering of the elements, either before or after consecration.” ⁴

III. The third point to be marked is the important significance of the change in the Prayer of Consecration.

In 1549, we have the words—“Hear us (O merciful Father) we beseech Thee; and with Thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ,” etc. ⁵

But in the Consecration Prayer as altered in 1552, there is no asking at all for anything that might seem like a change in the elements, no asking that they may even BE anything to us—though such an expression might have been *explained* in a very sound sense. No. The uprooting process must do a clearing work even here. And in the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI., the Consecration Prayer only asks that “we

¹ See Appendix, Note X.

² See Appendix, Note Y.

³ See Appendix, Note Z.

⁴ Posthumous Charge of Archbishop Longley, p. 34.

⁵ In Gorham's “Reformation Gleanings,” p. 143, note r, instead of the quotation from the *Consecration Prayer* of Edward's First Book (as so highly approved by Bucer), should have been given, I think, the words of the Prayer of Humble Access. That prayer was indeed commended by Bucer. But the *Consecration Prayer* (especially the part quoted) Bucer judged very objectionable; and the change made in Edward's Second Book was entirely in accord with his suggestions. (See Bucer's *Censura in Scripta Anglicana*, p. 456, sqq., Basil, 1577; and Nicholls's Additional Notes, p. 53; also Perry in “Declaration concerning Kneeling,” pp. 404, 405, note.)

receiving these Thy creatures¹ of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesu Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood."

Of this prayer as thus altered it may be truly said, that when it asks that in receiving the elements we *may be* partakers of the "*res sacramenti*," it asks that which *does* indeed imply that the consecrated bread and wine may be received where the "*res sacramenti*" is not received; and therefore that there cannot be any such a Real Objective Presence of the body and blood of Christ under the forms of the bread and wine, as our opponents maintain.²

Let us hear what is said by Dr. Brett, the non-juror, of this new Consecration Prayer:—

"I was and am very desirous to believe that the Church of England holds the doctrine so plainly taught by our Saviour. But I know not how to reconcile the Consecration Prayer in the present established Liturgy to this doctrine; for that makes a plain distinction betwixt the bread and wine and our Saviour's body and blood; when, as Mr. Spinckes shows, and the words will bear no other construction than that, it was the bread

¹ "In 1552 the important step is taken of declaring the elements to be, even at the moment of reception, 'Thy creatures of bread and wine.' Moreover, the partaking of Christ's body and blood, though dependent on the reception of the bread and wine, is treated as a separate reception—*i.e.* a spiritual one. And the introduction into this sentence of the words 'according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion,' seems intended to suggest the thought which should be uppermost in the mind at the moment of reception; viz., not that the bread and wine are received as His body and blood, but that they are received in remembrance, etc.; as He said, 'Do this in remembrance of me.'" ("Principles at Stake," p. 272.)

² Dr. Grabe says—"The faithful may be, and are even by the Church of England, supposed to be made *partakers* of Christ's body and blood *spiritually*, without such a *mystical change* of the bread and wine; and consequently, the priest who *prayeth the former* doth thereby *NOT pray for the latter*. Supposing there was a necessary connexion between these two, . . . yet if he that asketh the former disbelieveth or denieth the latter, and therefore *putteth the same, on purpose, out of his prayer*, it may reasonably be questioned, if not denied, that God will give him what he doth not believe, and consequently doth not ask." (Grabe: "*De Forma Consecrationis Eucharistiæ*, etc.; or, a Defence of the Greek Church against the Roman," pp. 90, 91; London, 1721.)

Is not the *change* in the Consecration Prayer utterly unaccountable on any other supposition than this—that the Church of England *would not have* her ministers pray *for the latter*, or, at all events, desires *rather* to discourage than encourage their doing so; and that in a very marked way, seeing *SHE* hath *put the same on purpose out of HER prayer*?

Grabe's view, however, falls far short of the Real Objective Presence. His is the presence in the consecrated symbols, *not* of the *substance*, but of the *virtue* of our Lord's body and blood. (See pp. 75 and 92.)

which Christ said was His body; whereas the Consecration Prayer evidently supposes them to be two distinct things. 'Grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, may be partakers of Christ's body and blood.' Which manifestly implies the bread and wine to be distinct or different things from the body and blood. For if the bread be Christ's body, as Mr. Spinckes proves the words of institution teach, then he that receives or partakes of the bread must be a partaker of the body. And except they are supposed to be two things, then the prayer is that we, receiving or partaking of the body and blood of Christ, may be partakers of His body and blood."¹

"Such," says Dean Goode, "is the statement of a learned Divine, holding the doctrine, not² of the presence of the natural body and blood of Christ, but of their life-giving virtue, in the consecrated bread and wine, so as to constitute a virtual presence of that body and blood in them, and desirous of finding that the Church of England, in her Communion Service, sanctioned this modified view of the doctrine of a Real Presence. He declares it utterly impossible to reconcile this passage with the view."³

How much more, it may be asked, is this prayer (on the face of it) repugnant to the doctrine (as now taught) of the Real Objective Presence?

Before passing on, the reader must be asked to observe that, in the case of all these changes which we have been marking as intimating the uprooting principle which guided our Reformers in rejecting what might look like a "Real Objective Presence," THESE CHANGES ABIDE; and abide in spite of endeavours made to remove them.⁴ Slight alterations have since been made. The Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. has not been left untouched.

Nay: let me not desire to convey any false impression. Let me not seek to present to the reader one side only of the truth.

¹ See Appendix, Note AA.

² Dr. Brett is exceedingly clear in his teaching as to the impossibility of the true body of Christ being in substance present in or with the elements. Thus, for example, he writes—"We *can't* partake of His *natural* body, that is absent from us as far as heaven is from the earth. But His virtual body, His body in *spirit and in power* . . . is the body He may give and has given to be eaten and drunk by us in the Holy Communion." (On the Eucharist, p. 42; London, 1736. See also p. 43.)

³ See "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 616.

⁴ See Appendix, Note BB.

Let it, in all fairness, be confessed, and confessed without grudging, that our Communion Service has not been left altogether untouched by the influence of what may be called, perhaps a reactionary movement¹—reactionary, at least, in so far as some may think, or may have thought that in the reign of King Edward the axes of our Reformers struck too deep, and while rooting up the tares, disturbed sometimes the roots of good wheat. Such reactionary influence, indeed, so far as it has affected our Prayer Book, I cannot but think, has sometimes been much over-estimated.

But, be this as it may, the point which I desire to insist upon is this, that the broad view and the main features are unchanged.² And I think it most important for us in this matter to take as far as possible, a broad view, and rise above mere details. In the main, we may surely say, the substance of our Communion Book is unaltered.

Still we look in vain for the restoration of such expressions as before looked most like a Corporal Presence. Still we look in vain for any Invocation of the Holy Spirit on the Elements.³ Still we look in vain to find in the Consecration Prayer any asking for any such inherent change in God's creatures as the Objective theory requires. Still we look in vain for any such⁴ sacrificial language as the maintainers of that theory desire. Still we look in vain for any such adoration as we are told a "Real Objective Presence" demands.

Those who regard themselves as sacrificing priests ministering at an altar may indeed, using our service, seek to supply its deficiencies by unauthorized postures, and words spoken in secret. But not the less I think, must our maimed service (in their view) by that very maiming bear witness against them, bear witness, I mean, by what is absent, and absent because removed, that it does not hold, and does not teach, and is determined not to teach what, in their view, is the great doctrine of the Eucharist.⁵

¹ See Appendix, Note CC.

² Observe how Bishop Hall treats such alterations, in *Works*, vol. ix., pp. 646, 738, 739; Edit. Pratt, 1808.

³ See Appendix, Note DD.

⁴ The removal of the predominant sacrificial idea in Edward's First Book was conspicuous. But now "the Anglican Liturgy, *so far as any such sacrifice is concerned, presents AN ENTIRE BLANK.*" (See Dr. Heurtley on Declaration, p. 28.)

⁵ The following words of a Romanist may have weight with some: "Anglican divines themselves have admitted the error. Grabe wished the Mass could be restored. Others have said that the Reformation went too far. The Ritualists of the present day endeavour to supplement the Prayer Book from the Sarum rite.

After all that has been done in subsequent revisions the great and important changes which indicate the rejection of the Corporal Presence, remain substantially inviolate.

Doubtless, it may be urged, that after all, the evidence produced has failed altogether to prove that our Communion Service contains any DENIAL of the Corporal Presence—that no attempt even has been made to show that in this service our Church has said a plain “No” to that doctrine—that all that has been contended for has been her simply not saying, and refusing to say to it her “Yes.”

But let the subject be fairly considered in view of the question “What is it which we ought reasonably to look for in such a service?” Let it be granted—and I trust it *will* be granted as an axiomatic truth—that an office for administration of the Holy Communion ought to contain (1) NO *negations* of doctrine, (2) but the *teaching TO THE FULL*¹ of the positive doctrine of the Eucharist. And then *absence of teaching*, and *silence as to doctrine* in such an office, must be held to be a *significant absence*, and a *SPEAKING silence*.²

Yet what is all this but a confession of being in the wrong, that only makes the original crime more glaring.” (Canon Estcourt on the Dogmatic Teaching of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 59.)

¹ It may be said against this, that the Missal does not assert Transubstantiation. (See Principles at Stake, p. 290.) Our reply is, that thus the Missal bears its testimony against the novel dogmas of Rome. (See Bishop Patrick, Christian Sacrifice, pp. 56, 57. Edit. 1690; and Conference between Rainolds and Hart, pp. 533, 534, London, 1598; also Bishop Babington's Works, pp. 255, 256, London, 1615; and Dr. Heurtley on Declaration, p. 28.)

Bishop Harold Browne says, “They [the primitive liturgies] contain no invocation of saints, no mention of purgatory, no doctrine of transubstantiation. Even the Roman canon of the Mass has descended to the present day so far free from such admixtures as to be a *witness against* the corruptions of later days.” (Preface to Prayer Book interleaved, p. x.)

But besides this, it must in fairness be allowed that the cases of the Missal and the Prayer Book are not parallel. What the Missal has not, IT NEVER HAD. What the Prayer Book has not, *has been CAST AWAY*. Suppose now, that we knew as a historical fact, that the Missal *did* formerly contain several passages teaching plainly the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and that by the authority of the Council of Trent all those passages had been very carefully and thoroughly expurgated; would not the Missal then give evidence (as far as it went) of the *Rejection* of the dogma of Transubstantiation?

² Archdeacon Freeman takes this truth as the foundation of an argument against there being an object of Divine worship enshrined in the Elements, when he says that “it was evidently *unknown to the mind*, BECAUSE *unrecognised by the Ritual of the first ages*.” (Rites and Ritual, p. 36.)

Mr. Maskell says, “The liturgy is the great storehouse in which we are *to look for and find* the necessary declarations of the HIGHEST *Catholic truths*. . . . This may be relied upon as a mark which cannot deceive.” (Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, Pref., p. lvi.)

As regards *our own* Communion service, it is to be observed that the fifty-seventh

Much in the same way as when a witness has every inducement, and every reason for saying "Yes," and we know that (for some cause or other) his lips are sealed against a "No"—if he stands silent—we argue that that silence is denial; so, I think, from this silence in our Prayer Book, where silence *should not be* if our Church desired to say "Yes" to this doctrine, from the absence of this teaching where teaching on this subject should be *TO THE FULL*; we might fairly argue a strong presumption of our Church's denial, even if that silence and that absence stood altogether unaccounted for and otherwise unexplained.

How much more when we cannot but know that that silence is silence constrained, and that absence comes only of careful elimination, forcible expulsion, and deliberate rejection!¹ Surely we are not to forbid history to throw any light whatever on the interpretation of this silence.

Neither may we refuse to receive the light which is thrown upon it from the corresponding expurgation of our Ordinal. And certainly we are not to reject the light thrown upon it from other utterances of our Church, which in suitable places speak her "No" in language which ought to be plain.

At any rate our Mother Church may truly and justly ask of us her sons and daughters such a question as this—"What could I have done more, in such an office as this, to warn you against a doctrine which I trust all of you will renounce?"

Canon distinctly declares that "the doctrine both of baptism and of the Lord's Supper is *so sufficiently* set down in the Book of Common Prayer to be used in the administration of the said sacraments, as *NOTHING CAN be added unto it* that is material and necessary."

¹Canon Estcourt argues that "those who receive and use the Book of Common Prayer . . . do by that their formal act make a denial of the [Roman] Catholic faith. . . . They deny the Holy Sacrifice of the Eucharist. They deny the priesthood of the Church. They deny the Real Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist. They profess and assert that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is only a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice . . . and that Christ our Lord in the Eucharist is given, received, and eaten spiritually only, and not sacramentally or really." (*Dogmatic Teaching of Common Prayer*, p. 57.)

These words are not without their value as showing how the doctrine of our Prayer Book strikes one looking at it from a Roman Catholic point of view. Mr. Humphry, indeed (*Principles at Stake*, p. 290) passes something of a censure on this "sweeping conclusion." No doubt there are one or two words used by Canon Estcourt which need a caution against misunderstanding. But so far as it applies to those who unfeignedly *assent and consent* to our Service *as it is*, I cannot see how the conclusion is to be avoided, if our Service is to be viewed in the light—not of any mere inferences from what may be guessed to be probably the cause of this change or that omission—but of the *plain facts* of our Church's history and our Reformers' work.

And if it be said in answer—"Make a new Directory of your own, on another model altogether"—then would there not be some just ground for complaint, that her children should refuse to believe what she would teach, and understand what she would say, until she had quite taken from them an heir-loom, which in wisdom and love she had sought to preserve, that it might be accounted by them a privilege and a blessing?

But we may go further and say, that our Church *has* done more. For though our Communion Service does not, as it should not, deal in negations; yet we have as an appendage of the office a remarkable statement, which can scarcely be regarded as anything less than a very clear and positive denial of the doctrine in question. This statement is what has commonly been called the Black Rubric. And a brief notice of it must conclude this paper.

By the "Black Rubric" we mean the declaration which stands at the end of our Communion Service. It is as follows:—¹

"Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue); yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; It is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received or unto any Corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

This declaration was first inserted in the Second Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth, and there bore its witness to a steadfast and determined purpose to set the axe to the root of superstition.

¹ See Appendix, Note EE.

It bore its strong and decided testimony against any Real and Essential Presence of Christ's body and blood in the Elements. In the Prayer Book of Elizabeth this was altogether omitted.¹ And it may be that it was prudentially and ² wisely omitted, because in the circumstances of the time, while the teaching of the Church of England was to be teaching with a clear voice, yet it may have been not desirable (with many of the people still under the influence of former teachings, who were to be conciliated rather than repelled) to make the Communion Book needlessly offensive.³ Its restoration however was desired at the Savoy Conference in 1662, by the Puritan ministers. And though thought unnecessary ⁴ by the Bishops, IT WAS RESTORED.⁵ We may thank God it stands now at the end of our Communion Service with its emphatic protest against all adoration of the Sacrament, and its distinct declaration against the Corporal Presence.

But the force of this declaration and the strength of its protest are sought to be evaded. Indeed it must be plain that nothing short of evasion can serve the purpose of the "Real

¹ See Appendix, Note FF.

² It should be remembered, however (though it seems to be sometimes lost sight of,—see Bulley's Variations, Pref., pp. xiii., xv.), that the Prayer Book of Elizabeth, as it came from the hands of the committee of Divines, *did NOT enjoin* kneeling at the reception, but left it indifferent to receive *kneeling* or *standing* (the committee, as represented by Geste, evidently giving the preference to *standing*). (See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 54; Dugdale's Life of Geste, pp. 39, 149; Collier's Eccles. Hist., vol. vi., p. 249.) The change to kneeling appears to have been made by the Parliament, (see Strype, Annals, vol. i., chap. iv., p. 83, and Collier, vol. vi., p. 249,) or by the Queen (see Cardwell's Conferences, p. 21). The omission (or material alteration) therefore of the Rubric regarded as the work of the Divines, was *necessitated* by the fact that the posture of kneeling was not enjoined at all. Standing, however, and kneeling were both regarded as suitable postures for prayer. (See Geste in Dugdale's Life, p. 149.)

Moreover the Declaration was an appendage to, rather than (strictly speaking) any part of, the second Book of Edward. (See Bulley's Variations, pp. 221-223; and J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, p. 199, and Historical Introduction, p. xxxii.)

³ See Burnet's "History of Reformation," vol. ii., part i., p. 784, Edit. Oxford, 1829, and "Goode on Eucharist," pp. 613-4. Also, Bulley's Variations, Preface, p. xiii. On the doctrinal bearing of this and the corresponding change in the 28th Article, see especially Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., pp. 64-67, and 76-78.

⁴ See Appendix, Note GG.

⁵ "The Restoration of the declaration was viewed with indignation by the Romanizing party. Burnet says that 'The Papists were highly offended when they saw such an express Declaration made against the *REAL presence*.' Sheldon, when interrogated by the Duke of York upon the subject, did not attempt to explain away its force, but threw the blame on Bishop Gauden." (Dr. Blakeney in Protestant Churchman, July, 1869, p. 322. See Burnet's "History of his own time," Edit. Bohn, 1857, p. 125.)

Objective Presence." I must very briefly notice three schemes propounded for escaping its condemnation.

1. The first declares it not authoritative because it is neither a rubric nor a prayer.¹

2. The second alleges that it cannot be against "The Real Presence" now, because as re-inserted the words "Real and Essential Presence" were changed into "Corporal Presence."

3. The third holds "Real and Essential" as equivalent to "Corporal Presence," but maintains that by both is meant only a local, natural, *i.e.* a carnal, physical, organical Presence.²

To the first, I cannot think any answer to be necessary.

To the second, I answer, that "Corporal Presence" being in the language of our Reformers and their successors only another name for the phrase "Real and Essential Presence" (in the sense which it bore in the declaration), the reason for adopting or allowing the change at the last insertion need not be sought further,³ than in a natural desire not to seem in any wise even verbally to condemn such men as Hooker, Jeremy Taylor and Morton, who (while still utterly repudiating that doctrine of a *Real* CORPORAL Presence which our Reformers rejected) had claimed on our behalf, or used in our service, (to convey the truth of our Reformed Doctrine,) that phrase⁴ "the Real Presence" which in the earlier history of the Reformation (though always accepted in an *explained* sense) had been perhaps too commonly given over to the opponents, that it might signify the CORPORAL PRESENCE of Romanists and Lutherans.

As commonly used in King Edward's days "Real Presence" meant a doctrine repudiated by our Reformers. As frequently used in days preceding the last review, it meant a doctrine which our Reformers and their successors contended for. Why retain such a phrase in a sentence of authoritative condemnation, when another was at hand, by which, with less ambiguity, might be expressed the doctrine which was to be condemned?⁵

¹ See Christian Remembrancer, Jan., 1866, p. 185. In Tract xc. it is said "The explanation before us adds, that it is philosophically impossible that it should be a particular kind of presence, a presence of which one can say 'it is here,' or which is 'local.' It states then a *philosophical deduction*, but to *such deduction* none of us have subscribed." (Pusey's Edition, 1866, p. 55.)

² See Appendix, Note HH.

³ See Appendix, Note II.

⁴ "It will be observed, that in both Rubrics, the question is as to the presence in the *Lord's Supper*, not specially in or under the Elements." (See "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 626.)

⁵ Mr. Perry very justly says, "Although the substitution of 'corporal' for 'real and essential' was due primarily, as it seemed, to Bishop Gunning, the majority, at least, of the Bishops must have consented to the change." (On De-

As to the third (and the answer will apply to the second also) without wading into the depths of the controversy, I think it will be enough (for those at least who have followed the course of these papers) to call attention to the whole connected structure of the Rubric.

First, I must ask my readers to observe the reason which is given for kneeling—viz.: (1) to signify humble and grateful acknowledgment of benefits, and (2) to avoid profanation and disorder. Surely these are not the reasons to give if adoration is due to the very Presence of the Son of God there present under the forms of Bread¹ and Wine.²

And, *secondly*, I must ask my readers simply to mark the reasons given for "No adoration." Here is no reason given of CAUTION,³ lest some might unwarily be led to worship the

claration concerning Kneeling, pp. 337, 338.) What, therefore, may have been Bishop Gunning's views on the subject, appears to me to be a question immaterial to our purpose.

¹ See Dr. Heurtley's "Remarks on Declaration," p. 9, who quotes the words of the Bishops at the Savoy Conference.—"The posture of kneeling best suits at the Communion, as the most convenient, and so most decent for us, when we are to receive, as it were from God's hand, the GREATEST OF SEALS of the kingdom of Heaven." Language (as Dr. Heurtley observes) "strangely below the occasion, if that 'greatest of seals,' be nothing less than the Lord Himself, veiled under the forms of bread and wine."

Dean Goode says, "To CONDEMN kneeling to the consecrated elements because of a supposed CORPORAL presence of Christ in them, and at the same time to ADVOCATE kneeling to them on account of a REAL presence of Christ in them, called 'supernatural,' 'essential,' and 'substantial,' is a distinction, which I trust, will ever be left in the hands of those who invented it." ("On Eucharist," ii., 625.)

Dr. Blakeney says, "The declaration disclaims adoration either to the Elements or 'ANY corporal presence.' It is monstrous to hold that adoration should be rendered to Christ's body in the Elements, and yet to repudiate adoration to 'any corporal presence.' It is a palpable contradiction between a theory and a statement, and an effort to reconcile things diametrically opposed." (Blakeney's Common Prayer, p. 417.) See also a valuable note in "Goode on Eucharist," i., pp. 31, 32.

² See Appendix, Note KK.

³ In such a caution Romanists and Ritualists might agree.

Leibnitz says:—"It should be recollected that this white, small, and bread-like object neither is Christ, nor is believed to be Christ, nor is made an object of adoration. And if it does occasionally occur that the people are not rightly instructed as to the true object of adoration in this sacrament, there is no doubt that this is a subject of deep concern to the Church, and that she desires to use every means for its correction." (System of Theology. Russell's Translation, 1850, p. 128.)

"As to adoration, Mr. Machonochie says:—'I believe that Christ, Himself the very reality of the Sacrament, in and with the Sacrament, out of and without the Sacrament, wherever He is, is to be adored:—but that the earthly part, as Irenæus calls it, the visible, as Augustine, is not to be adored.' I believe that we, in the mysteries, adore the Flesh of Christ, as did Ambrose, and not it, but Him, who is worshipped on the altar."

"And this is exactly what Gardiner said: 'At which time, nevertheless, that is not

Elements, instead of the Body present under their forms. No. But One reason given is that Christ's natural body is *in heaven* and NOT HERE. The question of *adoration* is made here to rest on the question, WHERE IS CHRIST? Where is His BODY? This is no question of visible or physical or organical Presence. It is simply the question of the PRESENCE *itself*.

Observe the answer of our Church to the question of the Adoration is "No" because the answer of our Church to the question of Christ's bodily Presence is "In heaven¹ and not here."²

adored that the bodily eye seeth, but that which faith knoweth to be there invisibly present.' (Page 229.)

"Cranmer in reply, asks :— 'What moved the priests to lift up the sacrament so high over their heads. . . . *If they worshipped nothing that they saw, why did they rise up to see?*' (Page 229.)

"And yet, to eschew one inconvenience (that is to say, the worshipping of the Sacrament) they fell into another as evil, and worship nothing there at all. For they worship that thing (as they say) which is really and corporally and yet invisibly present under the kinds of bread and wine, which (as is before expressed and proved) *is utterly nothing*. (Page 229.)" (Mass in the Church of England, p. 15.)

¹The following words will show the views of a Roman Catholic concerning the Black Rubric: "Mr. Cobb believes in the real presence of our Lord under the species; but, how can he refrain from adoration? How can he say that the adoration would be idolatry? If the substance of the bread and wine be changed, and nothing remain but 'the natural properties,' and if he believe that our Lord is there, why does he not confess his Presence by the outward and natural act of adoration? If it be replied that adoration is refused to the 'bread and wine,' that is to the 'accidents' which remain, nothing further need be said; and we must be content with observing that nobody ever thought of adoring the accidents. . . . Now the 'black rubric' says that no adoration 'ought to be done' either to the Host, 'or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood.' The reason given for this refusal is that the 'bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances,' and that 'the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here.'" (Dublin Review, Jan., 1869, p. 247.)

After all that can be pleaded to the contrary, it is scarcely possible to question that the Rubric has reference to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and is intended to defend the Church of England from all *approaches* to that doctrine. Who ever laid it to that charge of the Church of England, that in bidding her children to receive the Communion on their knees, she was leading them into peril of idolatry and false doctrine far beyond anything which was taught or practised in the Church of Rome?

[Compare the following from Crakanthorp: "*Vos de præsentia Christi CORPORALI in Eucharistia certissimi; cum neque ex Scripturis, neque testimonio priscorum Patrum, neque sensu, neque ratione certi sitis, sed vanam solum, ineptam, et impossibilem de hoc opinionem fovetis, et ut Idolum vestrorum cordium colitis. . . . Putemus subesse illis speciebus ipsum Christi corpus, an ideo in illis latens Christi corpus, magis à nobis in hostiâ adorandum, quàm ipsa Deitas Christi latens in pane, in ligno, in lapide, in sacrificio, in quovis homine, est in illis adoranda? Ratio adorationis vestræ est præsentia Deitatis, quia Christus Deus ibi latet. Cum igitur ratio eadem adorationis sit in aliis quæ dixi, cum verè ac realiter Christus Deus sit in pane, in lapide, in quovis homine, cur non procumbitis ad pedes cujusvis sacrificii, cujusvis hominis, ut Christo in illis latenti latrariam exhibeatis?*"

² Footnote on next page.

With those too who now maintain the Real Objective Presence, the question of *Adoration* is the question of the *Presence*. The answer to the question of adoration depends on the answer to the question, "Where is Christ's body?"¹ And their answer to the question of the adoration is "YES," because their answer to the question "Where?" (of the presence of Christ's body) is "THERE"—i.e., "there" "under the form of bread and wine."

Hear the words of Dr. Pusey:—"The question . . . as to the adoration of our Lord present in the Holy Eucharist

De præsentia Christi, quâ Deus est, in illis omnibus certissimi estis: de præsentia Christi, quâ homo est, in aut sub illis speciebus panis incertissimi estis. . . . Non major metus Idololatriæ, aut adorandi hominem, aut lapidem in quibus latet Christus Deus, quàm est metus Idololatræ, aut adorandi hostiam in quâ latet Christi Corpus? Exime animo meo hunc scrupulum, et erit tibi gratia magna. Dic clarè cur Corpus Christi quod illic putatis præsens, adoretis; et Deitatem Christi, quod hic certò scitis præsentem esse, non adoretis. . . . *Præsentiam, inquis, hanc REALEM et CORPORALEM Christi nos supponimus . . . vos falsum supponitis. Ex FALSO supposito, FALSA religio, falsus et idolatricus cultus, falsum quodvis consequi potest. . . . Ex falso hoc supposito, hostiam adoratis, et adorandum dicitis.*" (Crakanthorp, *Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, Anglo-Cath. Libra. Edit., pp. 474-476. See also passages quoted in Appendix, pp. 571-577.)]

But the Church of Rome does not mean by *corporal presence* a gross material presence—not a *sensible, tangible* presence—"but" either as in Dean Goode's view, "precisely that sort of presence which is imagined by the authors under review," (see "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 623, and Pusey's "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 323, 324; also, "Is healthful Reunion impossible?" pp. 87, 88. See also Bishop of St. David's Charge, 1869, pp. 111, 112, and above, Paper No. I., p. 6) or, at all events, one which differs from it in no way which (so far as I can see) can at all materially affect this question of adoration.

² And thus, our Church appears to me, to condemn, by implication, all teaching of the Presence of a Body after the manner of Spirits.

See above, Paper No. I., pp. 10, 11, and No. III., pp. 87-89. "Neque vero hic perstringendi sunt imperitorum oculi hisce subtilitatibus: existere Corpus Christi in cælo ad modum corporum; *ad modum vero spirituum* in Eucharistia. Etenim existentia sequitur necessario modum essentia rerum; neque proprie loquendo quidquam est existentia rerum præterquam earum essentia. . . . Quæ corpora sunt, et tamen dicuntur existere spiritualiter, dicuntur esse corpora, et tamen corpora esse negantur." (*Syntagma Thesium Theol: in academia Salmuriensi disputatarum, sub præsidio L. Cappeli, M. Amaryldi, J. Placæi*; Part II., p. 175. Salmurii, 1665. See Pusey, "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 323-325, and Perry on "Declaration concerning Kneeling," pp. 339, 340.)

¹ An exception must be made in the case of Archdeacon Freeman, with whom the presence of Christ's crucified body does not include the presence of His Divine Person. From the Archdeacon's deductions, however, from his own peculiar doctrines, Mr. Orby Shipley declares, that "all believers in the Real Objective Presence feel instinctively shrink." (*The Church and the World*, 1866, 3rd Edition, p. 497.) Mr. Medd in like manner disclaims this portion of the Archdeacon's teaching, (*The Church and the World*, pp. 325-329); and adds—"It is difficult to suppose that there is more than one believing mind in England wherein such an imagination could find place." (Page 328.)

should be considered, apart from any notion of seeming unfitness. . . . The simple question is—'Is our Lord and God present THERE?' If, or rather since, He is present THERE, the outward appearance is no more hindrance to us, than the dress He wore as man. St. Thomas, when he fell down and cried, 'My Lord and my God,' regarded not what raiment his Lord wore after His resurrection."¹

Can, then, the ADORATION *required* by the Real Objective PRESENCE of Christ's body PRESENT THERE *under the forms of bread and wine*, be reconciled with ADORATION *denied* BECAUSE Christ's natural body is "IN HEAVEN, and NOT HERE;"² and BECAUSE it is "*against the TRUTH* of Christ's natural body to be at *one time*"³ in MORE PLACES THAN ONE?"

In conclusion—(let it be said without bitterness, and let it be said without offence)—I believe that the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence (whatever they may think of some isolated parts) must feel⁴ and do feel, must acknowledge and will⁵ acknowledge, that our Communion Service, as a whole—regarding what is absent as well as what is present—is out of tune with their most cherished views of Eucharistic doctrine.

From the bottom of my heart (God knows) I would there were not this disagreement.⁶

¹ "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 329, 330.

² Archbishop Wake, speaking of the change of words in the Rubric, says—"I must confess I will not undertake to say what the occasion of it was; If they thought this latter manner more free from giving offence than the other would have been, I think they did well to prefer it. Let every one entertain what notion he pleases of these things; this I have shown is the doctrine of the Church which we all subscribe: That the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and NOT HERE." (Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 79.)

³ A Romish writer says—"In my apprehension, either these our English divines must affirm this proposition of *one body at the same time* being in more places than one, or some other equivalent to it, to be true; or must cease to assert any *real, essential, or substantial* presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist, contradicting to the sense of the Zuinglians." (Woodhead, quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 626, note.)

⁴ See Appendix, Note LL.

⁵ See Appendix, Note MM.

⁶ "The zeal which Archbishop Grindal, Bishop Ridley, Dr. Taylor, and other the holy martyrs and confessors in Queen Mary's time, expressed for this excellent liturgy before and at the time of their death, defending it by their disputations, adorning it by their practice, and sealing it with their bloods, are arguments which ought to recommend it to all the sons of the Church of England for ever, infinitely to be valued beyond all the little whispers and murmurs of argument pretended against it: and when it came out of the flame and was purified in the martyrs' fires, it became a vessel of honour, and used in the house of God in all the days of that long peace which was the effect of God's blessing, and the reward (as we humbly hope) of a holy religion; and when it was laid aside in the days of Queen Mary, it was 'to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's religion'; they are the words of Queen

Believing, as I believe, that the service of our Church *is* in tune with the teaching of Scripture and of the Early Church, I cannot but desire with an earnest desire that the views and opinions of all her ministers might be brought into harmony also with our Reformed Liturgy as it is.

What cause for thankfulness indeed there would be, if so it might be!

Some of those who have been drawn towards the Real Objective View may be clinging to it in the persuasion, that every other view would make the Lord's Holy Supper a void and empty thing.

But by the change, they may be sure they would lose nothing of the *reality*,¹ nothing of the blessedness, nothing of the fulness, nothing of the true joy of the Eucharist Feast. Nay, rather, I am persuaded they would be gainers indeed. There would be a reality of Personal Presence, a reality of perfect atonement, a reality of full possession, a reality of personal appropriation, a reality of spiritual receiving, a reality of the soul's feeding, a reality of the supply for the soul's great hunger, a reality of assurance, a reality of joy and peace in believing—such as the theory of a Corporal Presence in the Elements cannot but tend rather to mar than to give.²

May He who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think, grant us with one heart and one mouth to glorify Him through Jesus Christ our Lord!

Elizabeth and her grave and wise Parliament." (Bishop Jeremy Taylor; Preface to "Apology for Set Forms," vol. v., pp. 237, 238. See also p. 248.)

¹ See Appendix, Note NN.

² "The certain truth is, . . . that none give so great advantage to the *figuratists*, as those that contend for *oral* manducation, and make the sacramental feast common both to worthy and unworthy." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 717.)

APPENDIX.

I have (somewhat unwillingly) reserved for an Appendix, some notes, whose length prevented their standing conveniently in the body of this Paper. These notes will be found, some of them, to trespass beyond the proper limits of my subject, which is confined to the question—"What is the real teaching of the English Church?"

I have allowed myself to step out of this path, in some few of these notes, from being assured that many of my readers would be thankful to have that doctrine, which I have desired to show to be *our* doctrine, vindicated from the charge of being a departure from the faith once delivered to the saints.

Note A, see p. 284.

"So it was said, as a just ground of complaint, of old :—They tried it [*i.e.* Edward's first Book] by points and syllables, and weighed every word." (See Jeremy Taylor in Works, vol. v., p. 237.)

The maintainers of the "Real Objective Presence" cannot, I think, but be sensible of the minuteness and frailty of the threads to which they are constrained to cling, when they attempt an appeal to the Communion Service.

It is admitted, indeed, by the writer of the 81st of "Tracts for the Times," that of the doctrine of the sacrifice there are but "*SLIGHT indications.*" And this is attributed to the "*disciplina arcana*" of the Anglican Church. (See Goode's "Rule of Faith," vol. ii., p. 350.) Mr. Humphry, while aiming at finding shelter for them, speaks of the doctrines of the Objective Presence, and of the Eucharist Sacrifice as left "to be found by those who seek them in a *FEW expressions* which are of *doubtful and disputed* interpretation." And again he says that service "contains phrases of ambiguous meaning, in which those disputed doctrines are believed to have found a refuge, like the prophets in the caves of the earth." (Principles at Stake, pp. 289, 290.) One can scarcely help asking,—Did it look as if Israel's own teaching was the teaching of the prophets, when those prophets hid themselves in the dens and the caves? Does it look as if the teaching of the Church of England is the teaching of doctrines on the Eucharist, which dare not show their heads in our Communion Service, but are to be found, if found at all, hid, as it were, in the dens and caves of the earth?

So also the Bishop of St. David's while earnestly maintaining

"liberty of thought and speech on this point" (p. 66), says, of the comparison of the work of the earthly priest with that of the offering of the Great High Priest in heaven, "we find that there is not [in our own Communion office] a word to suggest it to any mind not previously imbued with the opinion, and which did not import it into the words AGAINST *their* PLAIN and NATURAL meaning. It is not to any transaction which is taking place in the heavenly sanctuary that the Church turns our thoughts in the Prayer of Consecration, but to that which took place in the Great Chamber at Jerusalem at the institution of the Lord's Supper." (Charge, 1869, pp. 58, 59.)

Mr. Neal speaks of "the obscurity in which our offices involve the doctrine that the Holy Eucharist is truly and properly a propitiatory sacrifice," and calls this "our weak point." (Essays on Liturgiology, p. 5.)

It should be observed that these "dens and caves" in our Service seem to be of quite recent discovery. Let the reader be asked to peruse Baxter's paper "The Exceptions against the Common Prayer which I offered the Brethren when they were drawing up theirs" in "Reliquiæ Baxterianæ" (or Baxter's Narrative of his life and times), pp. 308, sqq., London, 1696, and especially p. 312, also the exceptions to the Prayer Book presented at the Savoy Conference (especially Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 318-323), as well as other publications of Puritan exceptions to the Book of Common Prayer: and he can hardly fail to observe how the discerning eye of the Puritan failed to detect those lurking places of the Corporal Presence, which by some seem to be regarded as clearly revealing themselves under the glass of the Ritualist.

Let it be asked,—Is there anything remaining in our Communion Service so sacrificial as the following?—"See here Christ dying in this holy representation! Behold the sacrificed Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world! It is His will to be thus frequently crucified before our eyes." Yet this is a part of the exhortation in the Savoy Liturgy, composed by Baxter. (See Hall's *Reliquiæ Liturgicæ*, vol. iv., p. 61.)

What Bishop Hall thought of the teaching of our Liturgy will be seen by the following quotation:—"Since, therefore, the body of Christ cannot be said to be corporally present or received by us, it must needs follow, that there is *no way* of His presence or receipt in the Sacrament *but* SPIRITUAL, which the Church of England hath laboured *so fully to express*, both in her Holy Liturgy and publickly authorized Homilies, that there is NO ONE POINT of *Divine truth* which she hath more punctually and plainly laid down before us." (Bishop Hall's Works, vol. ix., p. 370; Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

Note B, see p. 284.

As to any arguments drawn from the reverent use of the consecrated elements, see note in Paper No. II., p. 33.

As to any arguments which may be drawn from position of

minister, sides of table, etc., I refer the reader to Dr. Blakeney on the Common Prayer, pp. 441-443; and Paper by Mr. Hobart Seymour in *Christian Advocate*, October, 1869. See also *Principle at Stake*, pp. 286-289; and Bishop of St. David's Charge, 1866, pp. 78, 79; and Charge, 1869, pp. 50, 51; Fortescue's Letter to Archdeacon Freeman on Weekly Communion, pp. 33, 34.

It must be remembered that what is now called "the shockingly irreverent theory of the Puritans," which "led to the constant removal of the holy table into the body of the chancel, or church" (J. H. Blunt's *Common Prayer*, p. 160), was in truth, for very many years, not the theory only, but the enjoined practice, nay, it may be questioned whether it is not even now the only canonical practice (see Canon lxxxii. ; and Cardwell's *Synodalia*, vol. i., p. 405; see also Lathbury's *History of Convocation*, p. 311) of the English Reformed Church (a fact not to be overlooked in interpreting the words of the rubric before consecration, "standing *before* the Table"). And those who have marked in the writings of our Reformers the indications of their *decided repugnance* to the minister's *standing with his back to the people*, will need no arguments to convince them as to what must be meant by "the north side of the table" in the Prayer Book of 1552. As to the times of Stuart and Laudian theology and the last Review, (1) Bishop Wren's defence of himself for standing with his face to the east *only* on the ground of his *lowness of stature*, and his contending that north *part*, north *side*, and north *end*, were all one, (2) the fact that the Scotch Prayer Book of 1637 has "north *side* or *end*," (3) the drawings of Bishop Andrewe's chapel at Peterborough, and of other interiors (see Blakeney, p. 442), seem to furnish very strong historical evidence against what may be called the "*in dextro cornu*" theory. (See Canon Robertson's "How shall we Conform?" pp. 136-146, and 202, 203, 398, 384, and especially pp. 145 and 204; Edit. 1869.)

But (4) the following extract from L'Estrange's "Alliance of Divine Offices," (published in 1659, shortly before the last revision—see Blakeney, p. 442) seems to remove all doubt on the question:—"Shall stand in the body of the church or in the chancel. This rubric being not explicit enough as to the proper station of the Holy Table, is illustrated by comparing the 82nd Canon with Queen Elizabeth's first injunctions and succeeding orders. In the Canon the order is, that the table shall stand where it is placed, viz., at the east end of the chancel, 'saving when the Holy Communion is to be administered, at which time the same shall be placed in so good a sort as thereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants, and the communicants also may more conveniently, and in more number communicate with the minister.' Which words are almost verbatim transcribed out of the Queen's injunctions, these only super-adding:—'And after the Communion done from time to time, the same holy table to be placed where it stood before.' Nothing can be more express and demonstrative, that the table placed where the altar stood, was but seposèd, set out of the way, during

only the time of non-communication ; and that, at the time of the Communion, it was to be removed . . . ‘As for the priest standing at the NORTH SIDE of the table, this seemeth to AVOID the priest’s standing with his face towards the east, AS IS THE POPIISH PRACTICE.’ So the MS. collections of a learned man.” (Edit. Oxford, pp. 244, 245. See also Blakeney’s Common Prayer, pp. 499-501, and pp. 258-262.)

Possibly “the MS. collections of a learned man,” referred to by L’Estrange, may be the interleaved Prayer Book of 1625, which is now in the British Museum, among the Harleian MSS., No. 7311. It has inscribed on a fly-leaf:—“This book is noted for the most part by the hand of the most learned Doctor John Cosins, sometime Bishop of Durham, and was bought of Dr. White Kennett, now Bishop of Peterburgh, who found it by chance, in a private house in Peterburgh aforesaid.”

It was examined by the editor of Cosin’s Works, in the Anglo-Catholic Library, but not published, as being not in Cosin’s handwriting, nor from his pen. (See Preface to vol. v., p. 21.) It is, however, no doubt, the work of some learned Anglo-Catholic Divine.

In this book, as a note on the words “standing at the north side of the table,” there is written in the margin, “to avoid the fashion of the Popish priests, who stand with their face to the east.” (152.) There are other notes on the subject, on the interleaved sheet, and among them the following (153):—

“As the Primitive Church did choose to pray towards the east, to avoid the superstition of the Jews that prayed towards the west, so we do now pray towards the south, to avoid the superstition of the Papists, who use to pray towards the east. (Dr. Fulke.)

“Ad cujus mensæ septentrionalem partem minister stans orabit orationem Dominicam, etc. See Common Prayer Book done into Latin, by command, and authorised ; Anno 2^o Eliz.

“*Pars septentrionalis.*

“North end or north side both come to one, for in all quadrilateral and quadrangular figures (and the communion table is commonly oblongum—a long square) every part of it is a side, according to the rules of art, and propriety of speech, etc. (Coal from Altar, 153.)”

From the book last quoted by the annotator, the following quotation is taken :—

“When he that ministereth at the altar stands at the north end of the same, as we use to call it, he stands, no question, at the north side thereof, as in propriety of speech we ought to call it.” (A Coal from the Altar, 1637, p. 23.)

The following is from another publication of Heylin, with reference to the same controversy (of which a brief account may be seen in Perry’s “History of the Church of England,” vol. i., pp. 372-375 ; see also Lathbury, Hist. of Com. Prayer, pp. 168, 169):—

“Whether it be *pars septentrionalis*, the northern part, or *latus septentrionale*, the northern side, it must be equally displeasing to the foreign churches (for you mean only those of the Church of Rome) in which the priest officiating is enjoined to stand *in medio altaris*, with

his back towards the people; being a different way from that prescribed the minister in the Liturgy of the Church of England." (P. Heylyn's *Antidotum Lincolniense*, 1637, pp. 54, 55. See also Bishop Cosin's Note, given in Bulley's *Variations*, p. 145; and Archbishop Laud as quoted in the same, p. 183.)

Wheatly says, "If it be asked whether the priest is to say this prayer standing before the table, or at the *north end* of it, I answer, at the *north end* of it; for, according to the rules of grammar, the participle *standing* must refer to the verb *ordered*, and not to the verb *say*."

"So that whilst the priest is ordering the bread and wine, he is to stand before the table; but when he says the prayer, he is to stand so as that he may, with the more readiness and decency, break the bread before the people, which must be on the *north side*. [The point to be observed in the above, is the convertible use of the terms, *north end* and *north side*.] For if he stood before the table, his body must hinder the people from seeing; so that he must not stand there, and consequently he must stand on the *north side*; there being, in our present rubric, no other place mentioned for performing any part of this office. In the Romish Church, indeed, they always stand before the altar during the time of the consecration, in order to prevent the people from being eye-witnesses of their operation in *working their* PRETENDED MIRACLE; and in the Greek Church they shut the chancel door, or at least draw a veil or curtain before it, I suppose, upon the same account. But our church, that *pretends* no such MIRACLE, enjoins, we see, the *direct contrary* to this, by ordering the priest so to order the bread and wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency *break the bread, and take the cup into his hands, BEFORE THE PEOPLE*." (On Common Prayer; Edit. Bohn, p. 302. See also Nicholls's Note on "Standing before the Table.")

That at the last revision, Bishop Cosin's suggestion of "*north side* (or *end*)," was not adopted (see Medd's Introduction to First Book of Edward, p. xv., note; Rivingtons), can hardly be regarded as any evidence that the rubric was in future to be interpreted of the old "*dextrum cornu*."

Might it not equally well, or even much rather, be regarded as furnishing evidence that the Church declined to give authoritative recognition to the "altar-wise" position of the table? It was, no doubt, for the purpose of authorizing the *new* position (*altar-wise*) that the change to "side or end" had been introduced into the Scotch Communion Service; and it was, doubtless, with a view to having the same authoritative sanction in England, that Cosin made the suggestion.

Moreover, the rejection of the insertion upon such grounds was quite of a piece with the rejection of other suggestions from the same quarter; and in full accord with the very evident determination manifested at the last Review, not to let pass unchallenged anything which seemed to bear the stamp of Laudian theology. (See below, pp. 373, 374, 375, 377.)

I add the following extract from a pamphlet by Mr. Scudamore¹ (Rivingtons):—"In most churches the tables would from necessity alone have been set east and west, when moved into the nave or low down in the chancel. There would not have been room between the seats to admit of their being set lengthways across the church. The great reason of it, however, was that abhorrence of 'the sacrifices of masses,' and desire to obliterate the remembrance of them from the minds of the people which had led to the substitution of a moveable wooden structure for a fixed one of stone. It was conceived—and the feeling gained strength as the Puritan leaven worked more and more—that the sight of the table set *altarwise* might recall those 'blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,' and thus imperil souls. . . . It is evident, then, that men had what they imagined to be a good reason for the *tablewise* position of the altar. But as the reason for this position was the same as that for moving it at all, we cannot suppose that the revisers would secure one of these changes by a written law, and not the other. The revisers of 1552, doubtless, supposed that they had done both; and the revisers of 1559 and 1604 must have given them credit for it, or we should have heard of a desire at least to supply what to the Puritanism of that age must have appeared a very serious defect. But the only written law which bears on the subject is the order occurring in the same Rubric as that for moving the table, that the priest shall 'stand at the north *side*' of it. This was sufficient, however, if the word *side* were understood in its strict and proper sense. It made it necessary to give the table a north *side*, which could only be done by setting it east and west. That the Rubric was meant to be thus understood, we might infer from the two facts: (1) That only so could the altar-like appearance, so offensive to the then prevailing party, be quite done away; and (2) That the tables were everywhere so set—*i.e.*, with one *side*, properly so-called, towards the north, from the first publication of the Rubric." (Scudamore's "North Side of the Table," pp. 10, 11, 12.)

Note C, see p. 285.

I have thought this (as being more simple), preferable to saying that "holy sacrament" is to be understood as signifying "the out-

¹ Mr. Scudamore says—"At the Restoration it was evidently still understood that the Rubric was against the altarwise position of the holy table; for in the original MS. of the Book of Common Prayer, now in the library of the House of Lords, the word *part* was at first substituted for *side*. It was cancelled, and the word *side* is written over it." ("North Side of the Table," p. 23; Rivingtons.)

It will be observed that Mr. Scudamore rejects the "*dextrum cornu*" theory as untenable (pp. 6, 7), and adduces evidence as to the general practice (before Laud's time) of placing the table not *altarwise* but *tablewise* (pp. 10-17), as well as of the enjoined practice of removing the table at time of Communion (pp. 8, 9).

Mr. Scudamore, however, contends that "*side*" cannot mean "end" (pp. 18-22), and relies much on the *Answer* of the Bishops (not the Revisers) at the Savoy Conference, as to the fitness that in prayer "they should all turn another way." (Pages 31, 32. See Cardwell's *Conferences*, p. 353-)

ward and visible signs in their consecrated relationship to Christ's institution, and His presence of grace and power in the ordinance."

Our Reformers and their successors, with all their distinct repudiation of the Corporal Presence, did not hesitate sometimes to speak of the *res sacramenti* as being, in a certain sense, in the *Sacramentum*, by reason of this relationship: not, of course, in the outward sign, as being (in any sense) contained in it: not, of course, in it viewed simply in itself, but in it as viewed in connexion with the promise contained in the Saviour's institution, which connexion alone gives it a true title to the name of *Sacrament*; in it (in a word) viewed ONLY as the ordinance of Christ.

The reader may be asked to mark specially the following words of Bishop Reynolds, who was himself on the Commission of the Savoy Conference (on the Presbyterian side) and was, moreover, the composer (in all probability) of our General Thanksgiving: "As, by faith, we have the evidence,—so, by the Sacrament, we have the presence of things farthest distant and absent from us. . . . In this sacrament we do most willingly acknowledge a real, true, and perfect presence of Christ,—not in, with or under the elements, considered absolutely in themselves, but with that relative HABITUDE and RESPECT which they have unto the immediate use, whereunto they are consecrated." (Works, vol. iii., p. 68; Edit. 1826.)

Cranmer says—"All that love and believe Christ himself, let them not think that Christ is corporally in the bread. . . . For He is not in it, neither spiritually, as He is in man, nor corporally, as He is in heaven, but only sacramentally, as a thing may be said to be in the figure, whereby it is signified." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 238.)

Again, Cranmer writes—

"And therefore you gather of my sayings unjustly, that Christ is indeed absent; for I say (according to God's Word and the doctrine of the old writers), that Christ is present in His Sacraments, as they teach also that He is present in His Word, when He worketh mightily by the same in the hearts of the hearers; by which manner of speech it is not meant that Christ is corporally present in the voice or sound of the speaker (which sound perisheth as soon as the words be spoken), but this speech meaneth that He worketh with His Word, using the voice of the speaker as His instrument to work by, as He useth also His Sacraments, whereby He worketh, and therefore is said to be present in them." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 11. Compare Preface to Edit. 1551.)

The whole force of the objection seems to rest on the misconception that, because in our view the "*sacramentum*" may be separated from the "*res sacramenti*," therefore, the word "*sacrament*" cannot in our view be regarded as connoting anything beyond what is outward and visible. Whereas Beza is but expressing the true view of our Reformers when he bids us see in the sacraments the signs and pledges of Christ's body and blood, and "that in such sort that the same thing which is signified is offered to us to be received spiritually." (See Fulke, "Defence of Translation," p. 502.)

Hooker says that sacraments “*consist altogether in RELATION TO some such gift or grace supernatural as only God can bestow.*” (Edit. Keble, vol. ii., p. 219.)

Ursinus says—“*Hæ duæ res, nempe signum et res signata, uniuntur in hoc sacramento, non copulatione aliqua physica . . . sed significatione, obsignatione, et exhibitione unius per alteram, hoc est unione sacramentali, cujus nexus est hæc promissio pani addita, postulans fidem utentium. Unde patet, eas res in usu legitimo semper conjunctim exhiberi et percipi, sed non sine fide promissionis, intuentem et apprehendentem rem promissam in sacramento præsentem: NON tamen præsentem vel inclusam in signo, ut in vasculo, sed præsentem in promissione, quæ est pars potior, et anima sacramenti. Inepti enim sunt qui clamant, corpus Christi non posse esse in sacramento præsens, nisi sit in pane vel sub pane. Quasi vero solus panis absque promissione sit sacramentum aut præcipua pars sacramenti.*” (Ursinus, Explicatio Catechet, in Works, vol. i., p. 266; Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

Again, Ursinus says—“*Addet [Augustinus] sic infidelem habere integrum sacramentum, sicut habet integrum Evangelium, symbolum, verbum Dei, hoc est, ex parte Dei, offerentis in verbo et sacramentis res una cum signis, et jubentis utrumque simul accipi: sed non ex parte infidelium, qui verba audientes, et symbola videntes et usurpantes, ea quæ utrisque significantur, et promittuntur credentibus, fide non accipiunt. Non quidem possunt impii sua infidelitate quicquam de auctoritate et veritate verborum et sacramentorum divinorum detrahare; sed possunt tamen se ipsos spoliare bonis cœlestibus, quæ in verbo et sacramento ipsis a Deo offeruntur.*” (*Commonefact: Chytræi Consideratio*, in Works, vol. ii., p. 1279; Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

So Calvin also writes (and he repeatedly declares the same thing)—“*Objicitur sacramentorum efficaciam non pendere ex dignitate hominum. . . . Fateor, et ideo diserte addo, non minus malis quam bonis OFFERRI Christi Corpus: quod ad vim sacramenti et Dei finem satis est . . . quod respuunt, illud nihil imminuit vel mutat de sacramenti natura.*” (On 1 Cor. xi. 27. See also Calvin’s Works, Edit. Amsterdam, 1667, vol. viii., pp. 656, 666, 674, 692, 698, 744; vol. ix., pp. 256, 266.)

To just the same effect Bishop Field writes—“*This presence doth consist in this, that so often as the bread and wine in the holy sacrament are offered to any communicant, at the same instant the body and blood of Christ do also present themselves truly to the soul of the person; as, in the word, Christ is truly offered to those that hear it; and howbeit the hallowed bread and wine be never separated from the things which they do seal and signify, but do always offer them by virtue of that promise which they do seal and confirm; yet God, to NONE but believers, doth inwardly perform that which outwardly he offereth.*” (*Parasceve Paschæ*, pp. 135, 136. See also pp. 120, 114, 116; Edit. 1624.)

And just this, in Bishop Field’s view, is the teaching of our

Catechism. He says—"As in this Supper both the body and blood of Christ be *offered* unto us, for our *ghostly refection*: so also both the one and the other are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received of the *faithful* in the Lord's Supper; as our Church teacheth in the Catechism." (Parasceve Paschæ, pp. 138, 139; 1624.)

Here, I think, will be found sufficient answer to Dr. Pusey's argument in "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church." (Pages 167, 168.)

It may be observed, that upon words of a subsequent exhortation, Bishop Hall builds an argument to show how clearly our Church teaches *spiritual* reception only. "What terms," he asks, "can be more express? It is bread and wine which we come to receive; that bread and wine is sacramental. It is our heart, wherewith we receive that Sacrament; it is our faith, whereby we worthily receive. This receipt and manducation of the flesh of Christ is *spiritually* ¹ done." And again he argues (still more forcibly) from later words—"If, therefore, we shall look upon and take these sacred elements as the pledges of our Saviour's love to us, and remembrances of His death for us, we shall not need, neither indeed shall we require, by the judgment of our Church, to set any other value on them." (Works, vol. ix., p. 371; Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

Note D, see p. 285.

Since writing the above, I have met with a small pamphlet entitled "Why I left the Church of England," by Edward Husband; from which it appears clearly that the writer from whom I have

¹ The words of the exhortation—"As the benefit is great, if with a truly penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy sacrament; (*for THEN we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ . . .*)," etc.—were both in the first and second Book of Edward VI. No doubt they *may* be read so as to harmonize well with a Romish or Lutheran sense. But only on the supposition of there being two *manners* of eating the *res sacramenti*—one *corporal* (which may be without benefit), the other *spiritual* (with benefit). And this supposition will be acknowledged, I think, by most persons to be excluded, if not (as it seems to me) by the whole structure of our Communion Service, yet certainly by the declaration of our Article, that the body of Christ is eaten "*only* after a heavenly and *spiritual* manner." (See Ursinus, Works, vol. ii., pp. 1229, 1230.)

Unless we would make our Prayer Book teach that which would be contradiction in terms of our Article, the words "*then* we spiritually eat" must tell of the *only real* eating; and the word "*spiritually*" must be understood, not at all as implying another eating *not spiritual*, but as introduced to guard against the supposition that in the *eating* mentioned is meant any oral manducation.

And thus read, the teaching of the exhortation certainly implies, that without a true penitent heart and lively faith we do *not really* eat the flesh of Christ nor drink His blood.

Compare Cranmer:—"As for wicked members of the devil, they eat the sacramental bread and drink the sacramental wine, but they do not *spiritually* eat Christ's flesh nor drink His blood, but they eat and drink their own damnation." (On Lord's Supper, p. 47. See "Sequel to Kiss of Peace," pp. 344, 345.)

But while I think it not unimportant that it should be clearly seen that this is the true and only admissible sense of the words of the exhortation, I would caution my readers against laying undue weight on such arguments.

quoted in this text is now a member of the Romish Church. I have not thought it necessary to alter what I have written ; but I gather from the following extracts that Mr. Husband must have completely altered his views of our Eucharistic Service, and of the comparative consistency with which it is administered by those who support and those who oppose the principles of our Reformation. I trust they may assist my readers to form their own opinion on the same subject.

"As an instance of my early Roman bias, I give the following example. When I was at College, preparing for Anglican orders, I was nearly dismissed by the Principal, on account of an article which I wrote for a magazine, upon the subject of 'Eucharistic Adoration.' In a pamphlet which the Principal published in answer to my statements, I find that one point which I strove to prove was this : that 'Transubstantiation was more Scriptural than Zwingli's doctrine.' This was in the year 1865. I find that then my belief in reference to the doctrine of the Real Presence was substantially the same as it is now ; for in my College article are these words : '*At the Consecration the Holy Spirit of God descends upon the Altar and the elements become the real, natural, corporal Body, and the Blood of Christ.*' Still, at that time I had no idea of ever leaving the Anglican Church." (Page 6.)

"I am writing from memory, and consequently under correction, but I do not think that in the twelve 'Catholic Tracts' which I published as an Anglican clergyman, there was doctrine contrary to the belief of the Holy Catholic Church. I merely state this by way of example, and to show how near an Anglican may come to Catholicism without being actually a Catholic. The great change I felt was, that what before had been all doubt and uncertainty, was now changed into certainty ; what before was forced, now became natural ; what before I had believed and taught *against* authority, I now believed by the command and with the express authority of my Church ; what before was shadow and phantom, was now substantial reality. *I am bound with thankfulness to acknowledge that it was 'Ritualism' that led me to Rome. This experience is being confirmed daily by the numbers who are seeking admission into the Fold. It is in this way that 'Ritualism' is doing good.*" (Pages 23, 24.)

"I had in my own house a private Oratory, in which I had what I believed at one time to be the Reserved Sacrament. When I had come to a conclusion in my own mind, that what I had reserved there was not the Blessed Sacrament, I determined at once to remove it. But when I entered the Oratory for this purpose, my courage failed me. There was the dim red light, which in Catholic Churches betokens the presence of the Most Blessed Sacrament, burning as religiously as ever ; and a feeling came across me, that I was going to commit an irretrievable act—viz., setting my seal to the belief for ever, as far as my own soul was concerned, that the Church of England was destitute of Sacraments. I felt I could not remove it that day ; and when I went the second day on the same errand, the light of the Sanctuary lamp disarmed me once more, and I left the Oratory

again with my mission unfulfilled. The following morning found me determined in my resolution to remove that day what I could not believe in my heart to be the Body and Blood of the Lord. With this resolve I went hastily into the room. As soon as I entered its threshold I started. The lamp had gone out! I had it immediately examined, and found it had not gone out for want of oil. I knew it was to tell me, that that which it had been burning before was not the Blessed Sacrament. So I readily accepted the omen; reverently consumed the bread and wine: after which the lamp was never again lighted.

"Although I had now given notice of my intention to resign my curacy, circumstances prevented me from ceasing to take duty in the Church of England; which I continued, with a heavy heart, for awhile to do, with the exception of celebrating at the Anglican 'Office of Holy Communion.' It was my practice before commencing a service to use privately a prayer to this effect,—'That I might be forgiven for taking part in a service which I doubted was Catholic.'" (Pages 19-21.)

[P.S.—If the newspapers are right, Mr. Husband has since *left* the Romish Church.]

Note E, p. 286.

By a reference to the same Directory (Neal's "History of Puritans," Appendix, vol. iii., p. 537) may be simply answered everything like an argument which may be built upon the *manual* directions, and "the fact of their reintroduction after a withdrawal of a century." (See Sequel to Kiss of Peace, pp. 315-16, and J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, p. 584; also Bulley's Variations, Preface, p. xxviii.) The manual directions as added at the last Review will be found (I think) more like those of the Assembly's Directory, than like those of the first Book of Edward VI. [See also J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, pp. 206, 207, where the Directory is called "this presumptuous and irreverent parody of the Liturgy," and it is said "When the children asked for bread this was the stone which was provided for them."] Indeed the Puritan Divines had excepted, before the last review, "We conceive that the manner of the consecrating of the Elements is not here explicit and distinct enough, and the minister's *breaking of the bread* is not so much as mentioned." (See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 321.)

And it will be found set down among "*the concessions*" which, after the Savoy Conference, the Bishops expressed themselves as willing to make—"10. That the manner of consecrating the elements may be made more explicit and express, and to that purpose those words be put into the rubrics, 'Then shall he put his hand upon the bread and break it,' 'then shall he put his hand unto the cup.'" (See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 363.)

Wheatly says, after speaking of the objections of Bucer—"The taking of the bread and the cup into the hands, has indeed since been restored, viz., first to the Scotch Liturgy, and then to our own,

even AT THE REQUEST of the *Presbyterians*, at the last review. But the signing of them with the cross [which was in the first Book of Edward] has ever since been discontinued : though I do not know that there is an ancient Liturgy in being, but what shews that this sign was always made use of in some part or other of the office of Communion." (On Common Prayer, Edit. Bohn, p. 298. See Goulburn on the Holy Communion, pp. 281, 282, and Maskell's Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, Pref., pp. 64, 65. Bilson's True Difference, pp. 658-661. Edit. 1585.)

Bingham says that "in consecrating the Eucharist, they [the ancients] always brake the bread, in conformity to our Saviour's example, to represent His Passion and Crucifixion." (Antiquities, Book xv., chap. xxxv., vol. v., p. 151. See Palmer's Origines Liturgicæ, vol. ii., pp. 144, 145.) The Westminster Confession declares, "The Lord Jesus hath, in this ordinance, appointed His ministers to declare His word of Institution to the People ; to pray, and bless the Elements of Bread and Wine, and thereby to set them apart from a Common to an Holy Use ; and to Take, and Break the Bread, to take the Cup, etc." (Chap. xxix. 3. Compare the Larger Catechism, pp. 131, 132.) The Middleburgh Prayer Book directs the minister "to break the bread and deliver it to the people." (See Blakeney's Common Prayer, p. 195.) And Baxter's Service presented at the Savoy Conference orders, "Let the minister take the Bread, and break it in the sight of the people." (See Blakeney's Common Prayer, p. 202, and Hall's Reliquiæ Liturgicæ, vol. iv., p. 70. See also Zuingle's Formula in Gerdes, Hist. Reform., vol. i., p. 243.)

Ursinus says¹—"Quod fractio panis non sit accidentaria quædam circumstantia . . . sed pars ceremoniarum a Christo institutarum, et præceptorum, perspicue testantur ipsa Evangelistarum verba." (Works, vol. ii., p. 47 ; Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612. But see the whole chapter "De fractione panis in Cœna Domini ;" also vol. ii., pp. 610, 660, 1225. See also Chamier, "Pan. Cath.," tom. iv., p. 183.)

"Nulla Liturgica est, in qua talis ritus [fractio] non præscribatur, et quamvis diversis modis fiat, summam semper habet Eucharistiæ reverentiam." (Renaudot, Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio, tom. i., Dissertatio, p. xx. ; Frankfort, 1847. See also especially L'Aroque's History of Eucharist, pp. 106-109 ; Walker's Translation, 1684. And Hospinian, Historia Sacrament., part i., lib. v., cap. v. ; in Works, vol. iii., pp. 395-398 ; Geneva, 1681. See also vol. iv., pp. 20, 21. See also Bulley's Variations, pp. 180, 181.)

Note F, p. 286.

See Appendix to Neal's "History of the Puritans," vol. iii., p. 537, also, Blakeney on Common Prayer, p. 428. I trust it will be

¹ Elsewhere Ursinus gives three reasons why the *breaking of the bread* should be restored. The reasons are—"1. Ob mandatum Christi. 2. Propter usum nostrum et consolationem. . . . 3. Propter *παίδεσιν* rudium ut videlicet plebs hoc pacto reducatur ab idololatria. . . ." (Vol. ii., p. 51.)

seen that here is sufficient answer to the arguments of Dr. Pusey in "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 172-180. In 1552 the words, "The body," etc., were omitted, and the Elements delivered with only "Take and eat this, in remembrance," etc.

But it has been justly observed:—"This alteration was wisely modified in 1559, when the form of 1548-9 was restored and prefixed to that of 1552. But it is obvious that the ancient form does not actually assert anything as to the Real Presence, and is open to widely different interpretations. It may be understood to mean The body of our Lord, etc., which is present in this bread, and The body of our Lord, etc., of which this bread is the sign or sacrament; and each person may put upon it the meaning which he thinks the more consistent with the context, or with the general teaching of the Communion Service. The words, as used in the unreformed Church, would doubtless be taken to imply a local presence, and perhaps even a change of substance. As they stand in our Service, they must take their colour from their surroundings, among which the sentence immediately following, Take and eat this in remembrance, etc., is one of the most significant." (Principles at Stake, p. 274.)

The following is from a Roman Catholic writer:—"The ancient words were restored in 1559, but with the Zuinglian form added to them. And as the ancient words are not so distinct but that they may be explained away, the revisers of 1559, followed by those of 1662, have allowed without repudiation the Zuinglian sense to be put upon the Catholic form." (Canon Estcourt upon the Catholic Teaching of the Book of Common Prayer, pp. 49, 50.)

"The customary, though not prescribed, form in England for delivery to communicants seems to have been 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.' This was retained by our Reformers with the important addition of the clause 'which was given for thee,' by which the thoughts *are directed to dwell on* THE BODY SLAIN ON THE CROSS, *not on the bread which is received*, as the source of salvation for body and soul." (Humphry's "Student's Common Prayer," pp. 140, 141.)

"The effect of the whole form, as we have it now, is to *carry the mind back to the SACRIFICE ON THE CROSS*, in faithful and thankful remembrance of which we are exhorted to eat and drink." (Ibid. p. 123.) See also "Prayer Book interleaved," (Rivingtons), p. 174.

The following paraphrase of Dr. Nicholls will commend itself, I think, as bringing out a perfectly natural meaning of the words:—"O my dear Christian Brother, May the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which this Bread that I here bring unto thee does represent, and verily exhibit to thee, if thou comest with a true faith and worthy Disposition, to receive it; May this Body so exhibited, and which our blessed Lord gave up to be sacrificed for us, be a Spiritual Preservative to thee, and bring with it such Grace and Influence as may incline thee to live with that Goodness and Piety, as that thou mayst by God's Grace and Favour, attain everlasting Happiness. There-

fore do thou take from me this¹ consecrated Bread, and eat it, as a Token that thou dost gratefully remember that Christ died to save thee, and do thou thankfully feed on Him in thy heart by Faith." (See also Bishop Jeremy Taylor. Preface to Apology to set forms, vol. v., p. 246 ; and Bulley's Variations, pp. 206, 209.)

On the desire of Ritualists to omit the latter clause in the form of administration, see Rivington's Protest, p. 5.

Bishop Hall says of the words of delivery, "No gloss in the world can make the words more full and perspicuous. So do we, in remembrance of Christ's death, take and eat the sacramental bread with our mouths, as that our hearts do feed upon the body of Christ by our faith. And what is this feeding upon Christ but a comfortable application of Christ and His benefits to our souls? Which is, as the prayer next following expresses it, then do we feed on Christ, when by the blessed 'merits and death' of our Blessed Saviour, 'and through faith in His blood,' we do 'obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion,' and are 'fulfilled with His grace and heavenly benediction.'" (Works, vol. ix., p. 372. Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

Note G, see p. 287.

The prayer is thus paraphrased by Dr. Nicholls:—"Grant us therefore, out of this Thy commiseration and goodness, that we may receive such benefit by the spiritual eating and drinking of His body and blood, that our bodies may be purified from all fleshly sins by the one, and our souls washed from all stains of guilt by the other ; and that we may for ever be joined with Him in a spiritual union. Amen." ²

¹ So Bishop Cosin, "As he [the Priest] delivers the sacred elements to any one, he says in an audible voice, 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life, take and eat *this* [SACRAMENT] in remembrance,' etc." (Religion of the Church of England, Edit. Meyrick, Rivingtons, p. 44.) See also the answer of the Bishops at the Savoy Conference, "It is most convenient that the minister deliver *the bread and wine* into every particular communicant's hand, etc." (See above, Paper No. VI., p. 253.)

² Similar teaching to that contained in this prayer will be found abundantly in the writings of Reformed theologians. The following is from a Reformed Declaration of Faith:—"Patet, non solum virtutem, efficaciam, operationem, aut beneficia Christi nobis præsentari et communicari, sed imprimis ipsam substantiam corporis et sanguinis Christi seu ipsam illam Victimam, quæ pro mundi vita data est, et in cruce mactata, ut per fidelem hujus Victimæ communionem, et cum Christo ipso unionem, consequenter etiam meritorum et beneficiorum, sacrificio ejus partorum, participes simus, et sicut ipse in nobis, ita nos in ipso maneamus. Et quidem, non tantum, quoad animam, sed etiam quoad corpus nostrum. Etsi enim, ut ore corporis rem terrenam, ita fide cordis, ceu organo proprio, rem cælestem acceptamus, secundum veterem illum Versiculum: 'Ventrem, quod terimus, Mentem, quod credimus, intrat:' tamen fide illa mediante, non solum animæ, sed ipsa corpora nostra, Christi corpori, per ejusdem Spiritum, ad spem resurrectionis et vitæ æternæ inseruntur et uniuntur, ut simus caro de carne ejus, et os de ossibus ejus, adeoque unum cum ipso corpus mysticum, quod Apostolus merito dixit mysterium magnum esse." (*Declaratio Thoruniensis*, 1645, in Niemeyer's *Collectio Confessionum*, pp. 682, 683.)

Waterland says of this prayer,—“In our public Service we pray that ‘our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood! The propositions couched under these words are several:—1. That our bodies are the temple of the Holy Ghost. 2. That sin *defileth* them. 3. That the sacrifice of Christ, removing *guilt* (other due circumstances supposed), makes them *clean*. 4. That there is an *application* of that sacrifice made in the Eucharist. 5. That therefore such application ought to be prayed for. So much for the *body*. The like, with a little change, may be understood also of the *soul*: and the conclusion from both parts is, that *guilt* is washed away in the Sacrament, *duly* administered and *duly* received, both from *body* and *soul*; which in other words amounteth to this: that *remission of sins* is conferred by the Eucharist to all *worthy* receivers.” (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 655. See also Willet’s Synopsis Papismi, vol. viii., pp. 388, 389. Edit. 1852.)

Bishop Cosin says of this prayer,—“In the first edition of King Edward VI.’s Liturgy, this was used after the consecration of the Elements, and before the receiving of them. The reason why it was afterwards (and now is) otherways ordered, seems to have been taken at those words (*after consecration*) contained in this prayer—*So to eat the flesh*, etc. ; which some men thought might otherwise have imported transubstantiation.” And he adds: “For the same purpose were the words in the Form of Consecration altered from *fiat nobis corpus et sanguis Domini*, to what they now are. In like sort, because the very term of *offering and sacrifice*, though well used of old, and in a far different meaning from that sense wherein the Papists used them, seemed nevertheless to sound their meaning, and therefore to give offence, it is altered into another expression of *Christ’s precious death* only.” (In Nicholls’s Additional Notes, p. 45. See also p. 53. See also Cosin’s Works, Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. v., pp. 470, 471.)

The only objection made to this Prayer at the Savoy Conference was, that it seemed “to give a greater efficacy to the blood than to the body of Christ.” (See Cardwell’s Conferences, p. 320.) Bucer specially commends it. (Script. Angl., p. 473.)

Willet says—“There is the same spiritual efficacy of Christ’s body and blood, yet a divers sacramental use and application.” (Synopsis Papismi, vol. viii., p. 389. See also pp. 374, sqq.)

“Potest sanguine anima intelligi quod anima sit sanguis.” (Notes in Harleian MS., No. 7311, p. 165. See above, p. 316. See also Horneck’s “Crucified Jesus,” p. 181; 1727.)

Bishop Field quotes from St. Ambrose—“That which we do receive is of power to defend both our body and soul. Because the flesh of Christ is offered for the health and salvation of our body, and His blood for our souls.” And he adds—“Let it be granted that we do, under either kind, receive whole Christ, with all His benefits; yet saith that holy Father, if it should be received in one kind alone, it should signify that it were powerful to defend but one only part of man (viz., either the *soul* or the *body*), and not both of them together. And it may be that the worthies of our Church had some relation to those reasons of St. Ambrose, or some such like, in that prayer which goeth immediately before consecration in our Communion Book; where we pray . . . that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood.” (Parasceve Paschæ, pp. 177, 178; Edit. 1624.)

We may take as a comment on this prayer the words of our Homily:—"The unbelieving and faithless cannot feed upon that precious body. . . . Wherefore let us prove and try ourselves unfeignedly, without flattering ourselves, whether we be plants of the fruitful olive, living branches of the true vine, members indeed of Christ's mystical body: whether God hath purified our hearts by faith, to the sincere acknowledging of His Gospel, and embracing of His mercies in Christ Jesus, so THAT at this His table we receive NOT ONLY the *outward Sacrament*, but the SPIRITUAL THING also; not the *figure*, but the TRUTH; not the *shadow* only, but the BODY; not to *death*, but to LIFE; not to *destruction*, but to SALVATION." (Page 400. See Dr. Heurtley's "Remarks on Declaration," p. 19.)

The argument of the Ritualists might be applied with equal force to the words of the Westminster Directory: "So (to) feed upon Him that He may be one with us, and we with Him." (See Hall, *Reliquiæ Liturgicæ*, vol. iii., p. 56.) And to the words of Bishop Hall: "Thy flesh is meat indeed. . . . Oh, that I may so eat of this bread, that I may live for ever!" (Works, vol. vii., p. 512; Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

Note H, see p. 290.

This does not look at all as if Cranmer in this matter was "weak and vacillating," (see Medd's Introduction to Walton's First Book of Edward VI., p. xiii.); or as if our English Reformers were weakly persuaded by foreign influence to do what was against their own convictions.

Dr. Cardwell writes:—"It cannot indeed be doubted, that the many learned foreigners who were at this time settled and actively employed in England, and were almost without exception in favour of more extensive changes, exerted an important influence on public opinion; but it is also certain that many of the English Reformers, and the most active and considerable among the commissioners themselves, were desirous of a greater degree of simplicity, both in faith and worship. Cox and Taylor, who were probably the working members of the commission, appear to have looked upon the oblation of the Eucharist as consisting merely of prayer, thanksgiving, and the remembrance of our Saviour's passion. Ridley, who entertained higher conceptions of its nature, had yet been the first, even before the Order of Council had been issued, to remove the ancient altars, and to place tables in their stead. And Cranmer, with the convictions he expressed in his Defence of the Sacrament and his Answer to Gardiner, could not have wished to retain the prayers of consecration and oblation, or to convey the impression which they were intended to make of a real unbloody sacrifice." (Cardwell, Preface to *Liturgies of Edward*, xxviii.-xxx.)

It must not be supposed that Ridley was at all behind Cranmer and other members of the Commission in opposition to and repudiation of any such sacrificial character in the Eucharist as forms a part of the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. (See Works, P. S. Edit., pp. 206-212; and Bulley's Variations, pp. 198, 199.)

Bishop Harold Browne says :—"The chief assistant to Cranmer . . . in the translations and revisions of the Liturgy, was unquestionably his great friend and counsellor Ridley. . . . Ridley showed the greatest zeal to induce conformity, both to it [the First], and also to the Second Service Book, which was far more extensively reformed. And indeed throughout, Cranmer and he appear to have walked in the same course, and acted on the same principles. It is of consequence to remember these facts. For, if Cranmer and Ridley were the chief compilers both of the Prayer Book and of the Articles; although the Church is in no degree bound by their private opinions, yet, when there is a difficulty in understanding a clause either in the Articles or the Liturgy, which are two standards of authority as regards the doctrines of the English Church, it cannot but be desirable to elucidate such difficulties by appealing to the writings, and otherwise expressed opinions of these two reformers. It is true, both Liturgy and Articles have been altered since their time. Yet by far the larger portion of both remains, just as they left them." (Intro. to Exposition of Articles, p. 7.)

Soames says, "This important business was entrusted, under royal authority, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Ely, and others of the episcopal order. *When these prelates met*, they determined, that many alterations should be made." (History of Reformation, vol. iii., p. 594. See Letter of Peter Martyr there quoted in note d. Soames, however, attributes the determination of the prelates to necessity, "for the sake of giving general satisfaction." (See p. 595.)

"None of the learned and pious Divines of our Church, at that time, expressed any Dissatisfaction concerning them [*i.e.* the alterations in 1552] or murmured against the omission of those usages, which the worthy Compilers of our Liturgy thought it expedient, and requisite, to discharge. But of late great clamours have been made against this second Liturgy. . . . The Pretence is, that this Review was made to humour Calvin, Bucer, and Peter Martyr; that the Liturgy was modelled according to their Fancy; its Beauty and Order defaced, and the most primitive and catholic usages expunged, to gratify the unreasonable importunity of those Foreigners. . . . As if our Bishops and Clergy were men of such abandon'd Consciences, so void of all sense of Religion, as to prefer the gratifying the unreasonable Prejudices of two or three Men, of less learning and Reputation than themselves, to Christ's own Institution and the due Administration of his Sacraments; and as if, after their many grievous accusations against the Church of Rome, for daring to mutilate Christ's Institution, by taking away the Cup from the Laity, they themselves would so far incur the same condemnation, as sacrilegiously to take away one half of the instituted Matter of that Cup. . . ." (Downes's Appendix prefixed to Sparrow's "Rationale," 1722, pp. 171, 172.)

That the principle upon which Reformers acted in asking the judgment of Bucer and P. Martyr was not one of servile surrender

of themselves to be guided by foreign judgments, but of earnest desire to profit by the counsel of men esteemed among them, is evident from the fact, that, though Bucer and Martyr knew some alterations were determined on, they were kept in ignorance what they were ; and P. Martyr durst not presume to ask Cranmer what would be done.¹ (See Downes's Appendix prefixed to Sparrow's Rationale, p. 176. Collier's Eccl. Hist., vol. v., p. 434. Archbishop Laurence's Bampton Lectures, pp. 246, 247.)

"If some particulars were altered agreeable to their judgment, it was, because our Bishops thought the reasons, which they gave, for making those alterations, conclusive and convincing: in other things, where their reasons had less force, they were as freely rejected. . . ." (Downes's Appendix, prefixed to Sparrow's Rationale, 1722, p. 176.)

Soames says, "Most of the changes had, indeed, most probably, been debated before any notice was taken of the foreign professors, and the Archbishop wisely abstained from communicating to Martyr a single particular of what had passed between himself and his brethren. His object in applying to the learned strangers appears to have been no other, than to obtain the fullest information before he acted. Upon the principle of coming thus prepared for the consideration of every question submitted to him, he had proceeded through all the stages of his public life, and to this cautious habit is owing the solidity of the decisions which emanated ultimately from him." (History of Reformation, vol. iii., p. 596.) "These alterations were made after most mature deliberation, the new book not being ready for use until more than twelve months had elapsed from the time in which preparations were first made for reviewing it." (Ibid. p. 606.)

The true key then to the influence exercised by these men may be said to be set before us in words written by Cranmer, with reference, apparently, to what had just been cast in his teeth by Gardiner concerning Bucer, "I, having exercised myself in the study of Scripture and divinity from my youth, (whereof I give most hearty lauds and thanks to God), have learned now to *go alone*, and do examine, judge, and write all such weighty matters *myself*; although I thank God, I am neither so arrogant nor so wilful, that I will *refuse* the *good advice*, counsel, and admonition of *any man*, be he man or mas-

¹ Gloucester Ridley writes, "A review was therefore determined: many things were thought proper to be altered. Bucer and Martyr were desired to give their opinions also. . . . But they had no further hand in the alterations than in delivering their censures, separately, to the Archbishop. . . . And as the Reviewers were *not moved* by them, but by some members of the Convocation; so, many alterations were agreed on before those Professors were consulted. . . . The persons engaged in this review are reasonably supposed to be the same who first compiled it; but chiefly the Archbishop and the Bishop of London. The first was very solicitous in procuring what helps he could to make it as perfect as might be; and the latter was most earnest in recommending it, as if it has been a thing he had well weighed and considered, which intimates their great concern in it." (Life of Ridley, pp. 333, 334, London, 1763.)

ter, friend or foe." (On Lord's Supper, p. 224.) See also Trevor's "Sacrifice and Participation," pp. 227-230.

The following account from the pen of Le Bas cannot fairly, I think, be charged with misrepresentation:—"Whatever might be his veneration for the name of Calvin, nothing was further from the Archbishop's mind than the thought of bowing down before the supremacy of Geneva. He was, however, quite ready to receive any reasonable suggestions which might be offered for the improvement of the devotional Formularies; and most assuredly he never imagined that the '*aid of the Holy Spirit*' had been vouchsafed in such measure to the original labourers in the work, as to supersede all possible necessity for future correction. He proceeded, however, in this matter with his usual circumspection. One of his first steps was to consult Peter Martyr, and Martin Bucer, the great theological authorities of Oxford and Cambridge. With this view, he had procured a translation of the book into Latin, executed by Alexander Aless, chiefly for the accommodation of Bucer, who was but little acquainted with the English language. He then told them, that he was desirous of their frank opinion relative to the alterations that might be expedient; adding, that the Convocation had already resolved that certain changes should be effected. But, wishing to be in possession of their unbiassed judgment, and having no intention to raise them to the dignity of arbitrators,—he cautiously abstained from specifying to them any one of the corrections which that Body had in contemplation. This application drew from Martin Bucer a copious list of animadversions; the whole of which were sanctioned by the concurrence of Peter Martyr. The review of the book was then completed by the Archbishop himself, assisted principally by Ridley and Cox. The suggestions of the two foreign divines were, in some instances, adopted, and in others, rejected; and the result of all these labours was the Book of Common Prayer, reduced very nearly to the precise form in which it appears at the present day." (Le Bas, *Life of Cranmer*, vol. ii., pp. 73, 74.)

In the Biography of Jewel, which follows Overall's Preface in the Edition of Jewel's Works of 1609, it is said: "This Blessed Prince (Edward VI.) in true zeal towards the House of God, sent for the chiefest builders and most renowned carvers and workmen from all parts of the Christian reformed world, to repair, adorn and beautify the Church of God in England. Among others Peter Martyr, as a spiritual Bazaleel was by his Majesty appointed Professor of Divinity at Oxford." (Compare Archbishop Parker as quoted in Goode's "Brotherly Communion," p. 9.)

"Annis quinto et sexto ejusdem Regis [Edw. VI.] emissum est aliud *senatus consultum*, de *explanando et perficiendo* publicarum precum libro; liberque ita explanatus statuto annexus est, cum formula consecrandi ministros adjuncta. . . . Primo Mariæ, hac lege antiquata, liber ipse disparuit, qui tamen, in solio fulgente Elizabetha, pristinam dignitatem et splendorem recuperavit. . . . Vos semper de auctoritate regia soletis delibare. Nos a contra nihil ab

Eduardo hac in causa gestum esse contendimus, quod non pium ac religiosum deceat principem." (Mason's *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, Lib. II., cap. 16, p. 211. Edit. 1625.)

Note I, p. 290.

"In the Prayer-book of 1549, the Rubric of the Missal to which reference has just been made, was replaced by one which directed the words of consecration to be said 'without any elevation or showing the Sacrament to the people'; so that if there had been any adoration, or even any reverential regard of the elements, short of worship, it was now suppressed." (Principles at Stake, p. 271.)

"So that upon the whole, besides composing many new prayers, and the expunging several others out of the Missal, and the laying aside many ceremonies therein, these things in particular were exploded: 1. Reverence towards the Altar, there being no rubrick for it in King Edward's First Book. 2. Elevation of the Sacrament. 3. Ostension. After this Book was established, the first thing moved for to be altered therein, was to have Altars changed into Tables. Bishop Hooper first motioned this in a sermon at court, saying, that as long as Altars remained, ignorant people and priests would dream of sacrifice. Thus, an Order of Council was issued out for changing Altars into Tables, Anno Edw. VI., 4, 1550. And after that, 1551, there was a Review of the Common Prayer, in which the Rubricks were altered, and the priest, instead of performing the Communion Service standing before the middle of the Altar, was enjoined to perform it standing on the North side of the Table. The present rubrick was likewise set down in the same words we have it, in the last review of the Common Prayer." (Dr. Nicholls's note on "Standing before the Table.")

On the rejection of "Elevation," etc., see Bishop Cosin's note communicated by Dr. Pickering, in Nicholls's *Additional Notes on Common Prayer*, p. 47. Mr. Orby Shipley argues from the omission of the prohibiting rubric in 1552, that Edward's *Second Book sanctioned* the Elevation, which he considers "as absolutely harmless, and yet so venerable and symbolical a ceremonial." He says, "Hence, again, the custom of Elevation, for a short while formally disallowed, and by the withdrawal of the inhibition as formally restored, once more became, and still continues to be, in accordance with early English use, the unwritten, traditional, and authoritative law of the Church of England." (The Church and the World, 1866, 3rd Edit., pp. 495, 496.) I must leave my readers to judge for themselves whether the *animus* of the changes in the *Second Book* will render any support to Mr. Shipley's theory.

Surely such a prohibitory rubric is to be regarded, as having in its very nature an exceptional, occasional, and temporary character, aiming a death-blow at a prevailing superstition. How then can the subsequent omission of such a rubric (and that in a Liturgy making a very decided onward step in the way of Reformation) be interpreted into a revival of that, which, before the prohibition, rested, on direct

injunction, (see Rubric in Sarum Missal, Church Press Co., p. 311), an injunction which is now nowhere to be found?

Let it be remembered (simply as a historical fact) that the "Reformatio Legum," carefully framed by Cranmer and others, probably in 1552 (see Cardwell's Preface, p. ix.), declares distinctly, "*Nec in altum tolli sacramentum hoc . . . patimur . . . nec conservari . . . nec adorari.*" (Pages 18, 19. Edit. Cardwell.)

Bishop Hall says, "This [adoration] was most—what in the elevation, the abolishing whereof clears us of this imputation. You know we hate this conceit." (Works, vol. ix., p. 440. Edit. Pratt, 1808.) Archbishop Laud distinctly repudiated everything of the sort. (See Bulley's Variations, p. 183.) And so did Bishop Cosin (see below, pp. 571, 575).

It is said by Catalini:—

"Verum tametsi . . . nil de Eucharistiæ Elevatione in Missa post verba Consecrationis perhibeant Sacramentarium Gregorianum, Alcuinus, Amalarius, Florus, ceterique vetustiores, altumque præterea de eo ritu Silentium fiat in antiquioribus Ordinibus Romanis; antiquior nihilominus est ipsa elevatio, quam hæretici comminiscantur." (Sacra Cæremoniæ. Rome, 1750. Tom. ii., p. 76.) No doubt the practice itself may be (as Catalini contends) more ancient than Innocent III. (1215). But what a loud condemnation of it in the confession of this earlier profound SILENCE! See also Migne's Patrologiæ Tomus LXXIV. De Rebus Liturgicis, Cap. xix., pp. 1007-1011, where observe (p. 1009) the appeal made to the adoration of the Greeks, which is admitted to be given to the elements *before consecration*.¹

"The Elevation of the Host over the head of the priest is your ordinary objection, for proof of Divine Adoration; although you have confessed that this was not of *prime* antiquity. But supposing Elevation to have been so ancient, yet was it not to the end it should be adored, no more than was the Book of the Gospel. . . . And why may not we think the Elevation, for Adoration of the Host, to be an after-invention, as well as the Elevation of the Chalice for the same end? whereof it is confessed by your own Ritualist, that *The Elevation of the Chalice, that the people might adore it, was not commanded until after the days of Thomas Aquinas.*" (Morton on Eucharist; book vii., ch. 3, sec. 2, pp. 512, 513; Edit. 1635.)

Bingham says, "There are most certain demonstrations that there could be no such thing as host worship in the ancient Church, not only taken from their not believing transubstantiation and the corporal presence, but from many topics solidly deduced and substantially proved." (See Book xv., ch. v., § v., vol. v., p. 256, sqq., and § iv., on Elevation, especially p. 247, sqq.)

See also Payne's "Discourse concerning the Adoration of the Host," in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 116, sqq.

¹ See especially L'Aroque's History of Eucharist, p. 559; Walker's Translation, 1864.

"Monsieur de Meux . . . tells us 'that the presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist, ought to carry all such as believe it, without all scruple, to the adoration of it.' This therefore, being taken as a principle acknowledged by them, it may not be amiss to observe, that since it is certain that neither Christ nor His Apostles appointed or practised, nor the Church for above a thousand years required or taught any adoration of this holy Sacrament; neither could they, according to Monsieur de Meux's principles, have believed the corporeal presence of our blessed Saviour in it. . . . When St. Paul reprov'd the Corinthians for violating this holy Sacrament, is it possible he could have omitted so obvious a remark¹ . . . that . . . instead of profaning, they ought, as they had been taught, to adore in it? . . . The elevation of the sacred symbols was not heard of till the seventh century, and then used only to represent the lifting up of Christ upon the Cross, not to expose it to the people to adore it. The bell, (A.D. 1240), the Feast of St. Sacrament, (A.D. 1264), the pomp of carrying it through the streets, (thirteenth century), all the other circumstances of this worship are inventions of yesterday. The exposing of it upon the Altar to make their prayers before it; their addresses to it in times and cases of necessity; their performing the chiefest acts of religion in its presence, never mentioned in antiquity." (Archbishop Wake's "Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England," in Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. xii., p. 124. See note in Paper No. III., p. 84, and Soames's "History of Reformation," vol. iii., pp. 142, 143.)

Note K, p. 291.

"It is a strong evidence of the prudence and discernment of the English divines, and especially of the primate who presided over them, that they drew up so temperate a form of public worship, when the great body of the people for whom it was designed were totally unfitted for any further alteration." (Cardwell's *Preface to Liturgies of Edward*, p. 16.)

"But this Liturgy being, as some conceived, not thoroughly racked from the lees of superstition, the King and Parliament, desirous to give all reasonable satisfaction to malcontents, gave order (probably to the same persons, or so many of them as were then living), that the Book should be faithfully and godly perused, explained, and made fully perfect." (L'Estrange, "Alliance of Divine Offices," Edit. Oxford, p. 44.)

"When men are in danger of burning, as they leap from the flames they consider not whither, but whence; and the first reflexions of a crooked tree are not to straightness, but to a contrary incurvation.

¹ "This divine Apostle condemns the Corinthians' irreverence in the celebration of this august Sacrament: he endeavours to make them ashamed of it . . . yet he doth not say a word unto them of its adoration, the consideration whereof had been of very great moment." (L'Aroque, "History of the Eucharist." Walker's Translation, London, 1684, p. 564.)

Yet it pleased the Spirit of God so to temper and direct their spirits, that in the first Liturgy of King Edward, they did rather retain something that needed further consideration, than reject anything that was certainly pious and holy; and in the second Liturgy, that they might also thoroughly reform, they did rather cast out something that might with good profit have remained, than not satisfy the world of their zeal to reform, of their charity in declining everything that was offensive, and the clearness of their light in discerning every semblance of error or suspicion in the Roman Church. The truth is, although they framed the Liturgy with the greatest consideration that could be, by all the united wisdom of Church and State, yet as if prophetically to avoid their being charged in after ages with a crepusculum of religion, a dark twilight, imperfect reformation, they joined to their own star all the shining tapers of the other reformed Churches, calling for the advice of the most eminently learned and zealous reformers in other kingdoms, that the light of all together might show them a clear path to walk in. And this their care produced some change; for upon the consultation, the first form of King Edward's Service Book was approved, with the exception of a very few clauses, which upon that occasion were reviewed and expunged, till it came to that second form and modest beauty it was in the edition of MDLII., and which Gilbertus, a German, approved of as a transcript of the ancient and primitive forms." (Bishop Jeremy Taylor's "Preface to Apology for Set Forms." Works, vol. v., pp. 234-5.)

Note L, p. 291.

This uprooting was the result of resolute determination in spite of opposition.

"A Review was made of the Book of Common Prayer, about the latter end of the year, by Archbishop Cranmer, and the Bishops. Divers things that favoured too much of superstition, were endeavoured to be changed or amended. But there were among them some *that MADE what OPPOSITION THEY could.*" (Strype's Cranmer, book ii., ch. xvii., p. 210. Edit. 1694.)

It was no wise inconsistent with such a determination to maintain that the *First Book* was, in its teaching on the Eucharist, *defensible*, and its expressions quite *capable* of a sound exposition.

So Cranmer, when his views were thoroughly *reformed*, defended what might be considered the point most difficult of defence in the *First Book*.

In reply to Gardiner, Cranmer says, "As for the Book of Common Prayer, although it say, that in each part of the bread broken is received the whole body of Christ, yet it saith not so of the parts unbroken, nor yet of the parts or whole reserved, as the Papists teach. But as in baptism we receive the Holy Ghost, and put Christ upon us, as well if we be christened in one dish full of water taken out of the font, as if we were christened in the whole font or

river ; so we be as truly fed, refreshed, and comforted by Christ, receiving a piece of bread at the Lord's holy table, as if we did eat an whole loaf." (On Lord's Supper, p. 64.)

So also, as regards the Catechism of Lutheran origin, the English translation of which had been authorized by Cranmer in 1548 ; Cranmer maintains, that it is *capable* of conveying a sound sense, if soundly explained and understood. He says in answer to Gardiner, "In that Catechism I teach not, as you do, that the body and blood of Christ is contained in the sacrament, being reserved, but that in the ministration thereof we receive the body and blood of Christ ; whereunto if it may please you to add or understand this word 'spiritually,' then is my Catechism sound and good in all men's ears, which know the true doctrine of the sacraments." (On Lord's Supper, p. 227, see pp. 19, 21, 106, 188, 190, 256, 374. See also Original Letters, P. S. Edit., vol. ii., p. 381, and note there and p. 643 ; and Strype's Cranmer, book ii., ch. v., p. 160 ; also, P.S. to Paper No. V., pp. 184, 185.)

Expressions might be quite capable of a sound interpretation, which yet, being capable not unnaturally of an unsound interpretation also, might be as *roots* out of which error and superstition might grow. Such expressions needed *explaining*. And the changes in the *Second Book* were such *explanations* of what was ambiguous in the *First*.

Note M, p. 291.

No doubt some parts were *new*, with *sufficient cause*. But what there is of *innovating work* in the compilation of our Prayer Book is all the more *conspicuous* and *telling*, and *indicative*, from its standing in such strong contrast with the *general conservatism* manifested.

"The old Roman Liturgy was a leprous house, the plague was spread in it : but our wise Reformers purged it from all appearance of infection. They picked out all the stumbling-blocks of idolatry, the walls were scraped and cleansed from the dust of superstition, etc.

"Though it has been accused of many plague-sores, and those sores pricked, yet no corruption hath appeared ; and therefore it is to be judged clean, and to enter into the holy campe." (From "Beaten Oil for the Sanctuary," 1641, quoted from the MSS. notes in the interleaved Prayer Book, Harleian MS. No. 7311, p. 13. Compare Bisse's "Beauty of Holiness," pp. 16, 17. And see Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, vol. ii., p. 2.)

To the objection of the Puritans that the Papists looked on our Book as a compliance with them, Hammond in answer, says, "I shall —1. demand, is there any *superstition* or *idolatry* in that part of the *Service* wherein we thus comply with them ? if so, 'tis more than a *compliance with Papists*, 'tis in itself a down-right damning sin ; and if there be not, but all that is *idolatrous* or *superstitious* in their service is reformed in ours, then sure this will be far from confirming

them in either of those, if they depend anything upon our judgments, or our compliance. 2. . . . This affirmation is as gross . . . as any one which the *Assemblers* have condemned in them. For, 3. The truth is notorious, that our *Reformers* retained not any part of *Popish Service*, REFORMED their *Breviary* and *Processional*, and *Mass Book*; AS they did their DOCTRINE, retained nothing but what the Papists had received from purer *antiquity*, and was as clear from the true charge of Popery, as any period in either *Prayer* or *Sermon* in the *Directory*; which argues our compliance with the *Ancient Church*,¹ and not with them; the very thing that *Isaac Cassaubon* so admired in this Church of ours, the care of *antiquity and purity*." (View of New Directory, in Works. Edit. 1684, p. 386.)

Bishop Jeremy Taylor says, "To the Churches of the Roman Communion, we can say that ours [*i.e.* our Liturgy] is Reformed; to the Reformed Churches we can say that ours is orderly and decent; for we were freed from the impositions and lasting errors of a tyrannical spirit, and yet from the extravagancies of a popular spirit too; our reformation was done without tumult, and yet we saw it necessary to reform; we were *zealous to cast away the old errors*, but our zeal was balanced with consideration and the results of authority: not like women and children when they are affrighted with fire in their clothes; we *shaked off the coal indeed*, but not the garments, lest we should have exposed our Church to that nakedness, which the excellent men of our sister Churches complained to be among themselves." (In Works, vol. v., pp. 233-4.)

"The Holy Scriptures and antiquity were carefully consulted; and all things examined according to the exactest measures that could be taken from them; and a diligent distinction made of what was Popery, and what was true and Catholic Christianity, that so the one only might be rejected, the other duly retained." (Abp. Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 77.)

"We will give an account of this form of Service which we use, deriving it higher than the *Roman Breviary* or *Mass*, from which it is charged to come; and shewing, where it shall be requisite, that the corruptions of the *Mass* are laid aside in it." (Bp. Cosin's Preface to Notes on Common Prayer, in Nicholls's Additional Notes, p. 2.)

"That they [our Martyrs] had a great opinion of the piety and unblameable composure of the Common Prayer Book, appears, 1, in the challenge made in its behalf by the Archbishop Cranmer, to defend it against all the world of enemies; 2, by the daily using it in time of persecution and imprisonment; for so did Bishop Ridley, and

¹ "Throughout this service [the Roman Mass] the aspect of Holy Communion as a means of partaking in the body and blood of Christ bears no proportion to its sacrificial aspect. In this respect the Roman Ordinary and Canon is *not only in the greatest contrast with our own*, but with all primitive Liturgies. If the Liturgies of St. Clement or St. Mark, for instance, agree in the main with the form of service received from the Apostles, the Roman does not." (Saddler in "The Church and the Age," p. 288.)

Doctor Taylor, who also recommended it to his wife for a legacy ; 3, by their preaching in behalf of it, as many did ; 4, by Hullier's hugging it in his flames, with a posture of great love and forwardness of entertainment ; 5, besides the direct testimony which the most eminent learned among the Queen Mary martyrs have given of it. Amongst which that of the learned rector of Hadley, Doctor Rowland Taylor, is most considerable : his words are these in a letter to a friend : ' But there was, after that, set forth by the most innocent King Edward (for whom God be praised everlastingly) the whole Church Service, with great deliberation, and the advice of the best learned men of the realm, and authorized by the whole parliament, and received and published gladly by the whole realm ; which Book was *never reformed but once*, and yet by that *one reformation* it was so *fully perfected* according to the rules of our Christian religion in every behalf, that no Christian conscience could be offended with anything therein contained, I mean of that book REFORMED.'¹ (Bishop J. Taylor's Works, vol. v., p. 248. See also Bishop Hall's Works, vol. ix., pp. 474, 646, 652 ; Edit. Pratt, 1808. And Bishop Gauden's Eccles. Angl. Suspiria, p. 88 ; 1659.)

Bishop Hall says, " If any man will now say, that our Prayer Book is taken out of the Mass, let him know rather, that the Mass was cast out of our Prayer Book, into which it was injuriously and impiously intruded : the good of those prayers are ours, in the right of Christians ; the evil, that was in them, let them take as their own. And, if it should have been as they imagine, let them know, that we have departed from the Church of Rome but in those things, wherein they have departed from Christ : what good thing they have is ours still : that Scripture which they have, that Creed which they profess, is ours ; neither will we part with it, for their abuse. If a piece of gold be offered us, will we not take it, because it was taken out of the

¹ A story was current among the exiles at Frankfort, to the effect that Cranmer " had drawn up a Book of Prayer an hundred times more perfect . . . yet the same could not take place, for that he was matched with such a wicked clergy, and Convocation, with other enemies." Mr. Jenkyns says, " Strype does not seem to have had sufficient grounds for attributing this report to Bullinger, but he is fully justified in treating it as altogether unworthy of credit. The Archbishop's ' authority,' he says, ' was now very great, so that there was undoubtedly great deference paid to it, as also to his wisdom and learning, by the rest of the divines appointed to that work : so that as nothing was by them inserted in the Liturgy, but by his good allowance and approbation, so neither would they reject or oppose what he thought fit should be in or altered.' To this it may be added, that if Cranmer's project had been really laid aside to make way for one with which he was not thoroughly satisfied, he would scarcely have undertaken a short time afterwards to prove, ' that not only the common prayers of the Church, the ministration of the Sacraments, and other rites and Ceremonies, but also all the doctrine and religion set forth by King Edward, was more pure and according to God's word than any other doctrine that hath been used in England these thousand years : ' and again, ' that the order of the Church set out at this present by Act of Parliament is the same that was used in the Church fifteen hundred years passed.' " (Preface of Jenkyns's " Remains of Cranmer," pp. liii., liv. See also Cardwell's Two Liturgies, Preface, p. xxxv., note ; and Lathbury, Hist. of Com. Prayer, p. 121.)

Channel? If the Devil have given a Confession of Christ, and said, *I know who thou art, even Jesus, the Son of the Living God*; shall not I make this Confession, because it came out of the Devil's mouth? . . . This then is the form which hath been compiled by learned and holy Divines, by blessed Martyrs themselves; who used it comfortably and blessed God for it. . . . Let us hate Popery, to the death; but let us not involve within that odious name those holy Forms both of administration and devotion, which are both pleasing unto God, and agreeable to all Christianity and Godliness." (Bishop Hall's Works, vol. ix., p. 813. Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

The following words are from the pen of the late Canon Hugh Stowell:

"So far from denying, we avow, that many, not to say most, of the prayers of our Church are far older than the Reformation, yea, have come down to us from the primitive periods of Christianity.

"And when some would tauntingly tell us, 'Yes, you borrowed them from Rome; and whilst you denounce that Church, you have not disdained to filch from her some of the choicest portions of your liturgy'; our answer is, 'They came to us *through* Rome, but they did not come to us *from* Rome.' They belonged to the primitive Church—and consequently to our own branch of it—long before the novelties of Romanism were engrafted on it. Those precious prayers resembled in their fate the vessels of silver and gold which had been dedicated to the worship of the true God in Jerusalem, but were afterwards carried into Babylon, and there desecrated to the worship of gods of wood and stone; and when the Reformation took place, our Reformers did as those who returned from the captivity in Babylon had done: they did not fling away and shiver to pieces the beautiful vessels that their fathers had used in their holy solemnities, because they had been defiled by idolaters, but they purified and sanctified them, and replaced them in their renovated temple. Even so, the prayer called the Prayer of St. Chrysostom, the glorious Te Deum, the incomparable Litany, and other portions of our services, resounded in the Churches of the saints long before it was dreamt that St. Peter was the vicar of Christ, and the Pope the successor of St. Peter; long before Christian worship was defiled with the invocations of saints and angels, the adoration of the Virgin, or the idolatry of the Mass. All, therefore, that our Reformers did, was to divest the pristine formularies of the corrupt additions which had been forced upon them in Rome, and to restore them to the renovated Church in their primeval purity and loveliness."¹ (Excellences of the English Liturgy, pp. 14, 15, S.P.C.K.)

¹Toplady writes: "'The liturgy,' says he, 'or common prayers, were chiefly taken from the offices of the Church of Rome.' This, I well know, is a pretty general opinion. But I cannot help believing it to be unjustly founded. The agreement, between some parts of our public service, and some parts of the Romish Missals, falls extremely short of proving the main point. We use the Lord's prayer (for example) in common with the papists; yet we receive it, not from Rome, but from the New Testament. A pen, not altogether contemptible, affirms, that the

Note N, p. 292.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor speaking of our Reformers, and our Prayer Book, says: "So that if they, dying in attestation of this Book, were martyrs, why do we condemn the Book, for which they died? *If we will not call them martyrs, it is clear we have changed our religion since then; and then it should be considered whither we are fallen.* The Reformers of King Edward's time died for it; in Queen Elizabeth's time they avowed it, under the protection of an excellent Princess; but in the sad interval of Queen Mary's reign it suffered persecution: and it is but an unhandsome compliance for Reformers to be unlike their brethren, and to be like their enemies; to do, as do the Papists, and only to speak great words against them. And it will be sad to live in an age that should disavow King Edward's and Queen Elizabeth's religion, and manner of worshipping God; and in an age that shall do as did Queen Mary's bishops, reject and condemn the Book of Common Prayer, and the religion contained in it." (Bishop Jeremy Taylor's Preface to Apology for Forms of Prayer, vol. v., p. 249.)

Hammond says of "The Liturgy of the Church of England, which was at first, as it were, written in blood, at the least sealed, and delivered down to us by the martyrdom of most of the compilers of it." (Preface to View of New Directory.) "I should think all men that have covenanted to reform according to the example of the best reformed churches, indispensably obliged to conform to the King Edward or Queen Elizabeth—English Reformation, the most perfect, regular pattern that Europe yieldeth." (View of New Directory, Works, 1684, p. 360.)

Note O, p. 294.

The general correctness of the view here taken of the revision in Edward's reign is admitted by Hardwick. The matter is so important that I desire to fortify my position by a few extracts from his History of the Reformation: "With reference to some, indeed, of the disputed questions, no concession could be drawn from the commissioners, because they felt that relaxation where the voice of Scripture and Antiquity was unequivocal, would have involved a dereliction of their sacred trust. The *only* office in which change of doctrine seems to be at all discernible is that which had *peculiarly excited* the displeasure of one section of the Church,—the Office for the Holy Communion. Nor is it probable that variations would have been there adopted if the structure had not been *repugnant* to the

compilers of the liturgy examined not only the popish forms, but likewise 'all other service books then in use.' (Downes). . . . 'Our Church of England,' says bishop Stillingfleet, 'hath omitted none of those offices wherein all the ancient Churches were agreed: and where the [primitive] British or Gallican [Church] differed from the Roman, our [present] Church hath not followed the Roman, but the other. And therefore our dissenters do unreasonably charge us with taking our offices from the Church of Rome.' " (Toplady's Works, 1825, vol. i., p. 411, note.)

new convictions of the *principal revisers*. We have seen the primate gradually abandoning his former tenets with respect to the nature of the Eucharistic Presence, even at the time when he was actively engaged in the construction of the First Prayer Book. Frequent conversations with John Laski, and prolonged examination of Scriptural and patristic authorities, had ultimately induced him to look with favour on the 'Calvinistic' hypothesis; and when, in 1550, he came down into the lists to wrestle with the champions of the Mediæval dogma, it was obvious that his principles, in this particular at least, had reached their full development (1550). As Cranmer had devoted *long and patient study* to the Eucharistic controversy, so he wrote upon it with no ordinary power and precision" (pp. 224-226). "Such was, probably, the state of mind in which the archbishop and some of his more active coadjutors now *resolved* to modify the structure of the Eucharistic office in the first Edwardine Prayer Book. They approached the task allotted to them *under strong excitement*, not, indeed, persuaded that the office then in use was *absolutely unjustifiable*, but prompted by a gradual *modification* of THEIR OWN FEELINGS AND IDEAS to alter some particulars which gave a handle to objections on the one side, and offended scruples on the other. And the changes ultimately brought about *correspond with this construction*. . . . Yet the various modifications thus effected wrought no very serious changes in the character of the Prayer Book. It was still, in all its leading features, and in the great bulk of its materials, an accumulation of ancient wisdom, a bequest of ancient piety: it was the form of words and bond of faith uniting English worshippers with saints and martyrs of antiquity; it was 'the Primitive Church speaking to the generations of these latter days.'" (pp. 228, 229. See also Soames's "History of Reformation," vol. iii., pp. 178, 179.)

Such a statement as the above, from the pen of Archdeacon Hardwick, renders it needless to say anything in refutation of the theory that in 1552 "accident, not design, seems to have ruled the day." (See "The Church and the World," 1866, Edit. iii., p. 485.)

When, however, it is said that the task of revision was approached "under *strong excitement*," we must not understand *such excitement* as leads men to do hastily and intemperately what, after calm deliberation, may be regretted. This appears from what is truly said of "*the new convictions*," formed after "*long and patient study*," resulting in *resolution* to modify the structure of the Eucharistic office. Nothing, indeed, could well be more unreasonable than to regard the changes made as made with undue speed, or under any temporary pressure. The subject of revision had been brought before Convocation as early as 1550, and many alterations then concluded. (See Peter Martyr's Letter, Jan. 10, 1550-1, in Collier's Eccles. Hist., vol. v., p. 434; and Hook's Lives, Series ii., vol. ii., p. 284. Also Procter on Common Prayer, pp. 34 and 31.)

Indeed, it would appear more than probable that *at the time* of the drawing up the *first* Prayer Book some matters were retained

only as a temporary measure, with the intention of removing them from a *second* book. Thus Bucer and Fagius write to the ministers of Strassburg, April 26, 1549: "We yesterday waited upon the Archbishop of Canterbury, that most benevolent and kind father of the Churches and of godly men; who received and entertains us as brethren, not as dependents. We found at his house, what was most gratifying to us, our dear friend Doctor Peter Martyr, with his wife, and his attendant, Julius, Master Immanuel, [Tremellius] with his wife, and also Dryander, and some other godly Frenchmen whom we had sent before us. All these are entertained by the Archbishop of Canterbury. . . . As soon as the description of the ceremonies now in use shall have been translated into Latin, we will send it to you. We hear that some *concessions* have been made both to a *respect for antiquity*, and to the *INFIRMITY of the present age*; such, for instance, as the vestments commonly used in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and the use of candles: so also in regard to the commemoration of the dead, and the use of chrism; for we know not to what extent or in what sort it prevails. They affirm that there is no superstition in these things, and that they are *ONLY to be retained FOR A TIME*, lest the people, not having yet learned Christ, should be deterred by too extensive innovations from embracing his religion, and that they may be won over. This circumstance, however, greatly refreshed us, that all the services in the churches are read and sung in the vernacular tongue, that the doctrine of justification is purely and soundly taught, and the Eucharist administered according to Christ's ordinance, private masses being abolished." (Original Letters, P. S. Edit., ii., pp. 535, 536.)

And such an intention was perfectly in accordance with the wisdom which had previously (March, 1548) put forth "the order of the Communion"; by which (though the last rubric for *second consecration* directs "without any levation or lifting up") the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is to be delivered to the people under both kinds (according to the direction of Parliament and Convocation), but "*without the varying of any other rite or ceremony in the Mass, (UNTIL OTHER ORDER SHALL BE PROVIDED)*"; (see First Rubric; Cardwell's Liturgies, pp. 428, 432, and Pref., p. ix.), this being accompanied by a proclamation, in which the people are exhorted to conformity, "that we may be encouraged *FROM TIME TO TIME further to travail for the reformation* and setting forth of such godly orders as may be most to God's glory, the edifying of our subjects, and for the advancement of true religion. Which thing we (by the help of God) *MOST EARNESTLY INTEND* to bring to effect, willing all our loving subjects in the mean time to stay and quiet themselves with our direction, as men content to follow authority." (See Cardwell's Liturgies, p. 426.)

It is surely, then, a great mistake to speak at all of Edward's *First Book* as alone representing the true character of the *English* Reformation, and as the only Book which should be regarded as the genuine work of our *English* Reformers; and as if Edward's

second Book were to be set down to the work or the undue influence of *Foreign Reformers*, and to be looked upon as stamped with the character of the Genevan, as distinguished from the English Reformation. (See Heylin's *History of Reformation*, E. H. S. Edit., vol. i., pp. 227, 228; Collier's *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. v., p. 434; Brett's *Liturgies*, pp. 398, 399, etc., etc.; Medd's *Introduction to First Book of Edward*, pp. xii., xiii.; *The Church and the World*, 1866, Edit. 3, pp. 475 and 313; J. H. Blunt's *Common Prayer*, *Introd.*, p. xxx.; Bp. Jolly's *Christian Sacrifice*, p. 124.)

Much more must it be accounted, I think, a complete misapprehension to suppose that there was any intention in the minds of our Reformers of bringing our Liturgy into "stricter conformity with the earlier Sarum use"; and that "had they been allowed free course of action, and longer time for its development, there is little doubt that the Liturgy of that Book [1549] would have been assimilated yet more closely to the ancient office from whence it sprang."¹ (See *The Church and the World*, 1866, Edit. 3, p. 476.)

No doubt Calvin's influence, like that of Bucer and Martyr, was on the side of revision; but this is only saying that it was on the same side as our leading English Reformers. As to Calvin's language concerning the Prayer Book, there is some reason for believing that what he said was said under misinformation as to what the Book contained.² (See Blakeney's *Common Prayer*, p. 287, note, and p. 46, note.)

Note P, p. 294.

It is impossible to view the changes made in the *Second Prayer Book of Edward VI.* apart from their doctrinal significance. The

¹ Mr. M. F. Saddler writes—"The real question is this: Is the will of the Great Institutor respecting the celebration of His memorial communion to be found in the Missals and Ritual Directories of Mediæval Christendom? Are these so bound up with His glory that, after 300 years of desuetude, they are to be revived as far as possible, though the rending of our own Church, and the repudiation of Sacramental truth by our own nation be the result? We have men—grave, learned, devout men—who by their every argument *imply* this. Dare they *assert* it? With the account of the institution in the New Testament: with the Primitive Liturgies: with the history of the Early Church in their hands, dare they assert it? The English branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church has decided very emphatically that the words of the Mediæval Service were not acceptable to Him, for she has substituted for it a service, the great bulk of which is in very different language, notwithstanding its retention of certain features common to all old offices. She was, we believe, fully justified in making this change, for, compared with the most ancient types of Liturgy, such as the Clementine and Alexandrian, the service which she has set aside is new, and hardly 'reasonable' service. Judged by its own rubrics, and by the views of those who now use it, it is the most inconsistent service in existence." (*The Church and the Age*, p. 313.)

² If it be true that overtures were made by Calvin and others to Edward VI. on the subject of Episcopacy, and that his letters were intercepted by Gardiner and Bonner, and a forged answer returned in the name of the English Protestants, "wherein they checked Calvin, and slighted his proposals," (see note in Jenkyns's *Cranmer*, Preface, p. cv., note), it can hardly be wondered at that Calvin felt a little sore on the subject of the English Church and her Liturgy.

First Prayer Book might have been used in a Communion which rejected the Real Objective Presence. But it certainly would not have borne witness, as the Second does, and still more as the *change* from the First to the Second does, that this Church of England *hath* (to use Whitgift's words) refused the Real Presence.

And the question of restoring the use, or the permission to use the First Communion Service instead of the Second cannot now be entertained apart from views of doctrinal significance. Upon merely liturgical grounds some might regret that the changes made in Edward's days were so thorough and sweeping, who yet must be deeply thankful that those changes were made, and still stand, to testify to our Reformers' sense of the danger, and wise determination, as far as might be, to exclude the possibility of the growing up again of the doctrine they rejected. So again, opinions may be quoted of preference for the First Book from some eminent divines (see Medd's Introduction to Walton's "*First Book of Edward VI.*," p. xvi., sqq.), and if we saw no danger and no possibility of the bringing in again the doctrine, for rejecting which, many of our Reformers died, those opinions might be entitled to considerable liturgical weight. But if anything be wanting to justify the wisdom of our Reformers, and to make us grateful for having the *Second* Prayer Book instead of the *First*, surely it may be found in the shelter which such expressions of opinion seem to afford for those who in our days (when the danger is realized) would desire to undo the work of the Reformers, and therefore on doctrinal grounds would bring in the First Book, to crush out the very truth, to which the Second bears such important testimony.

Moreover, when it is pleaded that the Act of Uniformity which authorized Edward's *Second* Book speaks with approval of the *First*, it must be observed, 1. that such approval is modified by the words which speak of the Second as made *more perfect*; and 2. that such approval is clearly given to the *First* as *explained* by the Second (see the words "As well for the more plain and manifest explanation hereof as for the more perfection of the said order of common service. . . . The King's most excellent Majesty . . . hath caused the fore-said order of common service . . . to be faithfully and godly perused, explained, and make fully perfect." See Liturgies of Edward VI. in P. S. Edit., pp. 214-5), that is to say, that expressions in the First Book being capable of two senses, the Second Book takes away from it one, and stamping clearly the other sense, so *approves* it. (See Dr. Heurtley's "*Remarks on Declaration*," pp. 14, 15.) Thus it is that Cranmer, while the First Book is standing, explains the meaning of the Consecration Prayer, in language which afterwards becomes almost the very words of that Consecration Prayer in the Second Book. These are his words: "And therefore, in the Book of the Holy Communion, we do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but that *unto us* in¹

¹ So Herbert Thorndike writes: "These words *to us*, make an abatement in the proper signification of the *body and blood*. For the elements may be said to be-

that holy mystery they may be so; that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same, that we may be partakers of Christ's body and blood, and that therewith in spirit and in truth we may be spiritually nourished. And a like prayer of old time were all the people wont to make at the communion of all such offerings as at that time all the people used to offer, praying that their offerings¹ might be unto them the body and blood of Christ." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 79. See Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. x., p. 56; and Bishop Patrick, *Christian Sacrifice*, pp. 56-59, Edit. 1690.)

This being so, it must be obvious that it is quite vain for those who now dislike the *Second Book*, and desire to return to the *First*, to bring forward in their support from the Act of Uniformity, or from the writings of our Reformers, expressions of approval of the *First Book*. (See "The Church and the World," 1866, 3rd Edit., pp. 323,

come the body and blood of Christ *without addition*, in the same *true* sense in which they are so called in the Scriptures: but when they are said to become the body and blood of Christ *to them that communicate*, that *true* sense is so well signified and expressed, that the words cannot well be understood otherwise than to import, not the *corporeal substance*, but the *spiritual use* of them." (Relig. Assembl., p. 369, quoted in Waterland's Works, vol. iv., p. 689, note.)

So also Archbishop Laud says of the expression "*ut fiant nobis*" that "it clearly implies that they are *to us*, but are not transubstantiated *in themselves*, unto the body and blood of Christ, nor that there is any *corporeal* presence in or under the elements." (See Bulley's Variations, p. 184.)

"If it should be asked, How they are so *unto us*, if they be not first *absolutely so*? *Answer*: They are said to be so unto us, when the *beneficial effect* goes along with them." (Waterland's Works, vol. iv., p. 695, note. See also, Bishop Field's *Parasceve Paschæ*, p. 114, 1624; and Hooker, vol. ii., p. 362. Edit. Keble.)

Far otherwise Grabe writes, "*De forma Consecrationis*," p. 20. London, 1721.

¹ It was desired, at the last Review, that the Rubric should direct the Priest to "*offer up* and place" the elements on the Table. (See Archdeacon Harrison on Rubrics, p. 353.) And the rejection of this proposal is additional evidence of the wise caution of the Convocation, and the check which was given to the attempts then made to introduce Laudian Theology into our Prayer Book.

The offering of the Elements, however, (in some sense) is altogether distinct from the *Sacrifice* of the Ritualists, and has been taught or allowed by some of the strongest opponents of the Corporal Presence, as for instance by Bullinger (see Goode's "Rule of Faith," vol. ii., p. 374), by Peter Martyr (see *Loci Communes*, pp. 1390, 1654, Basil, 1580), by Baxter (see Hickeys's Treatises, vol. iii., p. 281, Ang. Cath. Library Edit.). On this subject see Bingham's *Antiquities*, vol. v., pp. 24-26, and Waterland's Works, vol. v., pp. 163 and 182.

As to the different senses in which the word "*oblations*" has been understood in the Prayer for the Church Militant, the reader may be referred to Bishop Patrick's *Mensa Mystica*, p. 35 (London, 1717); Cardwell's *Conferences*, p. 382; Goode's "Rule of Faith," vol. ii., pp. 376, sqq. Mant's *Clergyman's Obligations*, pp. 147, 148. *Essays on the Church*, p. 184. Robertson's "How shall we Conform?" pp. 185-188 and 394. Blakeney on *Common Prayer*, p. 433. Trevor's *Sacrifice and Participation*, p. 248. Bishop of Llandaff's Charge, 1866, p. 110. *Prayer Book* interleaved, p. 169. Humphry's *Student's Common Prayer*, p. 125. See also Bulley's Variations, pp. 155-159 and 163.

Mede says—"So have they [the Churches of the Roman Communion] for many ages disused this *Oblation of Bread and Wine*, and brought in, in lieu thereof, a *real and hypostatical Oblation of Christ Himself*. This *blasphemous Oblation* we have taken away, and justly." (Mede's Works, p. 376. Edit. 1677.)

476, and Cooke's Letter to Perry. "Of Ceremonies, etc.," p. 113.) What they want, to give any real support to their position, and what we ask them (in no captious spirit) to produce *if they can*, is an expression (either in the Act, or in the writings of our Reformers) of distinct and decided *preference* for the *First*, or *regret* for the changes made in the *Second*, and in particular an expression of adherence to that *doctrinal sense* admissible (or apparently admissible) in the *First*, which finds no place in the explanation of the *Second* Book of Edward. WE have no quarrel with our Reformers, nor with the Act of Uniformity for speaking well of the *First* Book. Even the Westminster Assembly say of the Prayer Book, that "it occasioned many godly and learned men to rejoice much in it at that time it was set forth, because the Mass and the rest of the Latin service, being removed, the public worship was celebrated in our own tongue." (Preface to Directory.) And as little should we desire to have any controversy on this matter with the Ritualists, for speaking in admiration of the *First* Book (in comparison¹ of the Service Books in use before) if (with our Reformers and the Act of Uniformity) they spoke of the *Second* Book as *more perfect* than the *First*. We should not even care to say a word against the choice of any, who (in our own or previous days) may have expressed (for reasons connected with Liturgical lore alone, or even with a desire to impress somewhat more of the character of a *commemorative* and *figurative* sacrifice) a feeling of *preference* for the *First* Book, if, in the matter of *doctrine*, they disclaimed all desire to add anything to the *Second*. Thus, e.g., Archbishop Sharp is quoted as supporting the preference for Edward's First Book. (See Bishop Jolly's "Christian Sacrifice," p. 123.) But how little support Archbishop Sharp will render to those *doctrinal views*, on account of which that Prayer Book is *now* by some preferred, will appear clearly enough from the following Extracts:—"He (St. Paul) says downright, that Christ was *never to be offered but once*. Aye, but say they, his meaning is, that Christ was never to be offered but once in the same form and figure: in another form and figure the Apostle allows that He is offered every day. If this be the Apostle's meaning, is he not wonderfully sincere in his affirmations? even just as sincere as I should

¹ The change from the Sarum rite in 1549 was *very great indeed*. Mr. M. F. Saddler says—"If we take even the Communion Office of 1549, and compare it with the Canon according to the Use of Sarum, we find that *by far the greater part of it is new*. It doubtless embodies more or less of the leading features of the ancient offices, as well as of that which it superseded; but, of the greater part of these features, both the wording and the liturgical position are very materially altered. . . . The leading ideas of the two services materially differ: whereas the Old Service is mainly a *sacrificial* rite, the New is *MAINLY a communion or partaking*; whereas in the Old Services the commemorative or sacrificial action (or rather actions) is altogether severed from the partaking on the part of the people, in the New it is inseparably bound up with it: whereas in the Old Service the Celebrant is everything, so that he can perform the *whole action by himself*; in the New, on the contrary, he is never *contemplated apart from the united action* of that mystical body of which he is the minister." ("The Church and the Age," p. 305.)

be, if I should make oath that I never saw such a person but once in my life; meaning, that I never saw him but once in such a garb or habit: but in other habits I cannot deny but that I have seen him a thousand times." (Works, vol. v., pp. 202, 203; Edit. Oxford, 1829.)

"For this virtue that they assign to this their sacrifice of applying to believers the benefits of Christ's first sacrifice, it is the strangest one that was ever heard of. . . . Was it ever heard that the benefit of a sacrifice was to be applied to men by the means of offering up another sacrifice? How can anything be applied to men, by being offered up and applied to God? It is just as if we should apply the physic, or the salves that are prescribed, not to the patient, or the wounded person, but to the physician who prescribes them." (Ibid. p. 205.)

When, therefore, Archbishop Sharp expressed his admiration of Edward's First Book, we may be sure he meant the First Book, as doctrinally explained by the Second.¹

We cannot but feel strongly that if now we were to lay aside the Second Book of Edward for the *First* (or for one framed upon the model of the *First*) the *First* Book thus *restored* would hardly be explained (according to the views of our Reformers) by the *Second* thus *rejected*. For would not the change be made under the pressure of influences which on doctrinal grounds *dislike* the *Second* Book, and would *choose* the *First* because of the *First's* admitting that sense which is disallowed by the explanation of the Second? (See "The Church and the World," 1866; 3rd Edit., p. 313.)

Very observable therefore, and highly significant are such words as the following from the pen of Mr. Orby Shipley:—

"The Church party emphatically deprecate under existing circumstances, any change whatever in the Prayer Book. But in the event of revision being determined upon by authority which they can alone acknowledge, they are prepared to advance towards that standard to which each successive restoration has approximated, and I have it in my power to say, that a large body of Churchmen (both lay and clerical), including all the foremost leaders of the Catholic school (and amongst them, I will add, the reverend and beloved teacher so lately taken from amongst us was one), in the event of a revision being forced upon the Church, would demand a restoration in conformity with the First Book of Edward VI. On such a question, by such petitioners, what is thus demanded must be entertained, and will in all likelihood, be conceded." ("The Church and the World," pp. 518-9.)

Note Q, p. 295.

The word "Mysteries" here seems to be so often misunderstood (almost as if it must be the nature of a "mystery" to mystify,—see

¹ In like manner Bishop Horsley's commendation of Edward's first book must (I think) be understood as involving no sort of approval of the *doctrine* of the Real Objective Presence. (See Bishop Horsley's Charges, p. 163. Dundee, 1813.)

Burgess ; Reformed Church of England, p. 150) that it may be well to give one or two quotations which may help to clear its true meaning. "Sacraments are called mysteries, because in a dark speech they hide other things which are more holy. And Paul willingly useth this word in his Epistles. And why this word was attributed to the holy signs of the Christian Church, there is a plain reason ; for these things are only known to the faithful, and are hid from those that are profane and unholy. And surely the preaching of the Gospel itself is called 'The Mystery of the Kingdom of God,' to teach us, that, the unclean being shut out, it is revealed to the only children of God." (Bullinger's Decades, v., 237.)

"It is called a mystery, or a holy secrecy ; for that our eye beholdeth one thing, and our faith another." (Jewel ; Sermon and Harding, p. 515.)

"Two . . . because what is intended by them [the sacraments] is not immediately discernible by what is done, without some explanation (their significancy being not wholly grounded in the nature but depending upon arbitrary institution, as that of words, which is of kin to them ; whence St. Austin calls a Sacrament, *verbum visibile*) have usually been called Mysteries (that is, actions of a close and occult importance, of deeper meaning and design, than is obvious to ordinary perception), and thence are also called Sacraments." (Barrow, Works, 1683, vol. i., p. 542. See Professor Hey's Lectures, vol. ii., p. 490.)

"The word *mystery* as used by St. Paul, signifies something kept secret and hidden, and generally something *sacred* and *divine*, which cannot be discovered by Natural Reason, but is UNFOLDED by Divine Revelation." (Wordsworth on Ephes. v. 32.)

"*μυστήριον* either from Gr. *μύω* to shut ; or from Heb. (mistar) from root (sathar) to hide ; hence something which is involved, or concealed, or symbolized by something external, as the soul in the body, — a *sacramentum*." (Wordsworth on Matt. xiii. 11. See Malan's Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Note, p. 5.)

"A most unscriptural and dangerous sense is but too often put upon this word, as if it meant something *absolutely unintelligible* and *incomprehensible*. A strange mistake ! Since in almost every text wherein *μυστήριον* is used, it is mentioned as something which is *revealed*, *declared*, *shown*, *spoken*, or which *may be known* or *understood*." (Parkhurst's Lexicon in voc. See Whitaker's Disputation, P. S. Edit., p. 252.)

No doctrinal argument then, it seems to me, in favour of the Real Objective Presence can be built upon this word. (See Freeman's Principles of Divine Service, vol. ii., part 1, p. 18, sqq. S. C. Malan, On Ritualism, pp. 68-71. Bingham's Antiquities, book x., chap. v., vol. iii., pp. 379, 380.)

Beza indeed (who constantly, like Calvin, applies the word *mystery* to the Eucharist) from this word makes an argument which tells powerfully against the Real Objective Presence. He says, "*Sæpe sum miratus fieri potuisse ut in Sacramentaria institutione explicanda,*

in qua constat figuratè¹ pleraque dici, quoniam hæc est *μυστηρίων* natura, nonnulli omnia ut propriè dicta acciperent." (Tract. Theol., vol. ii., p. 188. Genev., 1582.)

Indeed the expression "*high mysteries*" is used in the Middleburgh Prayer Book, which had the sanction of Cartwright and the approval of Calvin, and was but a compilation from the Genevan form. It contains the following passage:—"We do first therefore examine ourselves, according to St. Paul's rule, and prepare our minds that we may be worthy partakers of so *high mysteries*." See Blakeney, Common Prayer, pp. 191 and 438, note, who quotes from Bingham, "There is nothing more usual with the ancients than this way of speaking, to call every sacred rite and ceremony used in the Church by the name of sacrament or mystery." Thus, as Dr. Blakeney observes, "The word *μυστήριον* signifies not only a thing hidden until revealed, but a *similitude*."

In answer to the argument that "the presence of our Saviour in the Eucharist" is confessed by English Divines "an ineffable mystery," Archbishop Wake replies thus, "Well, be it so; what will he hence infer? Why 'this he conceives is said to be so in respect of something in it OPPOSITE AND CONTRADICTORY TO, and therefore incomprehensible and ineffable by human reason.' But supposing they should *not* think it so from being *opposite* AND CONTRADICTORY *to*, but because the manner how Christ herein communicates himself to us is hid from, and above our human reason; might not this be sufficient to make it still be called an ineffable and incomprehensible mystery? Whereas the other would make it rather PLAIN AND COMPREHENSIBLE NONSENSE. It is a *strange affection* that some men have got of late for CONTRADICTIONS; they are so in love with them that they have *almost brought it to be the definition of a mystery*, to be the revelation of *something to be believed* IN OPPOSITION TO SENSE AND REASON." (Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 80.)

Of the Romish doctrine and its defence, Archbishop Secker says, "They must not say, this Doctrine is a Mystery. For there is no Mystery, no Obscurity in it: but it is as plainly seen to be an error, as anything else is seen to be a Truth. And the more so, because it relates, not to an infinite Nature, as God; but entirely to what is finite, a Bit of Bread and a human Body." (Lectures on Catechism, vol. ii., p. 246. Edit. 1769.)

¹ So Bertram or Rathram says, "If there be no figure in that mystery, it is not properly called a mystery." ("Concerning the Body and Blood of Jesus," p. 147. Edit. Dublin, 1753. See also pp. 150, 171, 174, 175-181, 182, 191.)

"Hoc sensu Sacramenta dicta sunt *mysteria* in Græca Ecclesia, quia ipsa quidem sunt res externæ et sensibus obviæ, sed eorum significatio arcana est, et non nisi ex verbo Dei cognosci potest." (Ursinus, in Works, vol. ii., p. 1381. Edit. Reuter, 1612.)

"Apud Theologos posteriores immutata fuit hujus nominis ratio, ac appellarunt Sacramentum signum illud sensibile, sub quo latet arcanum spirituale: arcanum vero id quod latet appellavere rem Sacramenti." (Gaspar Contarini. Works, p. 331. Paris, 1571.) See also L. Aroque's History of the Eucharist. (Walker's Translation, 1684, pp. 257-260.) And Chamier's Panstrat. Cathol., tom. iv., p. 5; 1627.

"Is it not the case . . . that 'Holy Mysteries' did *not* mean holy concealments, but *showings forth*?" (Present Day Papers. The Eucharist, p. 14.) "I am afraid a spirit is abroad, to which there can be no greater recommendation of any doctrine, than that it shocks the common sense of mankind. . . . It must be remembered that in the present case the objection to the alleged *mystery* is, not that it is inscrutable, but that it is factitious, a creature of human speculation, the product of an arbitrary and fanciful exegesis, disguised by an accumulation of unmeaning and mutually contradictory terms." (Bishop of St. David's Charge, 1869, p. 67. See also S. C. Malan on Ritualism, p. 99; and Turton on Eucharist, pp. 221, 222.)

It must not be supposed that thus there is eliminated from "These holy Mysteries" that which is really hidden and secret and passing man's understanding in the sacramental efficacy, and the Divine operation for the souls of the faithful, through the faith of the Gospel. (See Goulburn on Holy Communion, pp. 288-290. Bishop Bilson, True Difference, pp. 806, 807.)

Hospinian says, "Quinam fieri possit ut Christi carnem in cœlis nunc positam nos in terris positi, quamvis spiritualiter, vere tamen per fidem participemus, ut vivificum illum succum inde hauriamus, hoc captum nostrum superat et mysterium magnum est." (Concordia Discors. in Works, vol. v., p. 46, b.) The same view is frequently expressed by Calvin.

So Beza says, "Etsi enim scimus Spiritum Sanctum, id est, Dei virtutem hoc operari, et quod ad nos attinet, solo fidei instrumento id omne a nobis percipi, tamen et Spiritus potentia, et fidei efficacia nostrum omnem sensum exsuperant: quo fit ut tota hæc actio valde proprie *μυστήριον* vocetur." (Tract. Theol., vol. i., p. 209. See also Beza as quoted above, Paper No. VI., p. 227; and Bishop Bayly's Practice of Piety, p. 445. Edit. 1668.)

Note R, p. 296.

"That phrase, the Lord's Supper, being the phrase most commonly employed by the Church of England to describe the second of the two great Christian sacraments, might sufficiently express the exact ground assumed by the English Reformers, for the word 'Supper' involves the question at issue. The doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, as is now the fashion to call it, they resisted. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper they maintained. For the general fact I call an impartial witness. The Dean of Chichester, in his life of Archbishop Cranmer, says:—'Protestants of all shades of opinion were united on this one point, that the Mass should be turned into a Communion. The Mass was regarded as a sacrifice of our Lord for the quick and the dead. This the Reformers, one and all, denied. They maintained that it was a Communion, through which the faithful were united to God; and that the sacrifice was the offering of themselves, their souls and bodies, to God's service, in common with the hosts of heaven.' Now it is this idea of a Communion, a common partici-

pation, which is expressed in the word 'Supper.' The title as I have used it, consequently involves all the questions in dispute." (Mr. Garbett's Lecture, "The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper the Keynote of the English Reformation," p. 11.)

"But the word *Missa*, as it is used at present among the Papists, for a true and proper sacrifice of Christ offered in every celebration for the living and the dead is never used among the Ancients. And for this Reason the name of *Missa* or *Mass* is rejected by the Church of England, which having EXPLODED the Opinion of the SACRIFICE of the MASS, does DISCLAIM the use of the Word *MISSA* in Modern, though not in the Ancient Sense. Indeed in the First Edition of the Common Prayer Book under Edward the Sixth, the name of the Mass (as the Liturgy was then commonly called) was retained. But when men who were leavened with the Doctrine of the Papists detorted it to a wrong sense, it seemed good to the Bishops, that in the Second Edition of the Liturgy it should be omitted." (From Bishop Cosin's notes communicated by Dr. Pickering in Nicholls's Additional Notes to Common Prayer, p. 36. See his notes also in pp. 45, 48, 50, 51, 53. See also Cosin's Works, Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. v., pp. 301, 302.)

Note S, p. 297.

See note on No. 1, pp. 17-18. In the Canons sanctioned by Convocation in 1640 (see Collier's Ecclesiastical History, viii., pp. 181-188) is the following: "We declare that the situation of the holy table doth not imply that it is, or ought to be esteemed a *proper altar*, whereon Christ is again really sacrificed; but it is *and may be called* an altar by us, *in that sense* in which the primitive Church called it an altar, and in no other." (See Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. i., p. 405, and Humphry's "Student's Common Prayer," pp. 124-5, and Andrewes's Minor Works. Oxford Edit., p. 20.)

In Tracts for the Times, No. 86, the changes in our Services made by our Reformers are regarded as "a taking from us of part of our ancient inheritance—a withdrawal of our higher privileges—a thrusting us aside, and bidding us to take the *lower place*, the position of suppliants, and to 'weep between the porch and the altar.' And in this sense, the substitution of the term '*Table*,' '*Holy Table*,' etc., for that of '*Altar*,' is a strong instance of this our judicial humiliation. For what is this but to say, that the higher mysteries, which the word '*Altar*' represents, are partially withdrawn from view?" (See Essays on the Church, p. 152. See also Cudworth's Discourse concerning Lord's Supper, ch. v., pp. 27, 28; Edit. 1676.)

Note T, p. 297.

Compare the following:—"We believe that, as in heaven, Christ, our Great High Priest, ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father, pleading by His presence His Sacrifice of Himself once offered on the cross; so on earth, in the Holy Eucharist, that same body, once

for all sacrificed for us, and that same blood, once for all shed for us, sacramentally present, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the Priest, as our Lord ordained to be done in Remembrance of Himself, when He instituted the Blessed Sacrament of His body and blood." (Declaration of the twenty-one Priests.)

On this portion of the Declaration, the following remarks may be commended to the reader's careful attention:—

"To all . . . that possibly can be advanced, in support of the proposition that Christ our Lord renews His offering of Himself, it might be sufficient to say, that St. Paul¹ knew all (to say the least) that we can possibly know concerning the nature of our Lord's sacrificial acts in heaven, and concerning the conditions of His Human Personality. And yet he, knowing these things, *distinctly denies* any iteration of the offering of Christ Himself, and no less distinctly *affirms the UNITY, and ever-enduring efficacy, of THAT OFFERING.*" (Rev. W. B. Marriott in correspondence with Rev. T. T. Carter. Rivingtons. Part i., pp. 53-4.)

"In all Scripture, 'nothing is said' of any prolongation of the one act of oblation. How, therefore, can we be justified in deciding, upon imperfect analogies founded on the symbols of the Levitical system, that the oblation of Christ Himself was 'prolonged,' and is now being prolonged or perpetuated (as an act) of which Holy Scripture DECLARES *with the utmost possible emphasis*, that it was *ONCE made, in PAST time, and ONCE FOR ALL?*" (Ibid. Part ii., p. 66, note.)

"Bingham² shows that the word *sacrificium* was anciently applied to the entire service as applicable to the spiritual sacrifices of prayer and praise, and other devotions. Bingham says, '*Every part of divine worship had the name of sacrifice, and not only the service of*

¹ "Præstat Apostolum de Sacrificio Christi disputantem audire. Ille enim nobis omnem facile scrupulum eximet ex animo. Ille igitur primum instituens comparisonem inter Sacrificium Christi et Sacrificium Aaronicum, ait sub lege necesse fuisse sacrificium offerre καὶ ἡμέραν, Christo vero nihil opus esse id facere, quia id præstitit ἐφάναξ. Heb. vii. 27. Quod qua ratione ab eo dici potuerit haud equidem intelligo, si quotidie Christi sacrificium iterandum est. Quid enim? Hocce *vitiosum* fuit *per se* in sacrificiis legalibus quod tam sæpe repetita sunt? Id si ita est, *vitium idem* in sacrificio Christi hæret. Ideone id reprehendit in sacrificiis legalibus, quia in iis imperfectionem virtutis et efficacitatis arguit? Id ipsum in sacrificio Christi culpari potest."

(Syntagma Thesium Theologicarum in academia Salmuriensi disputatarum, sub præsidio Ludovi Capelli, Mosis Amyrald. Part iii. Salmurii, 1665.)

² "Under which name [the Christian Sacrifice] first know, that the Ancient Church understood not, as many suppose, the *mere Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ*; but the *whole Sacred Action*, or Solemn Service of the Church assembled, whereof this Sacred Mystery was then a prime and principal part, and as it were the Pearl or Jewel of that Ring." (Mede's Works, p. 356. Edit. 1677.)

[It will be understood, I hope, that extracts given in these notes from the writings of Mede and others, who have been appealed to as teachers of the Eucharistic sacrifice in former years, are not introduced for the sake of misleading the reader, and giving a one-sided view of their doctrine; but (partly at least) for the sake of shewing, how entirely distinct is the teaching of those who *were* regarded as teachers of high sacrificial doctrine from the teaching of those who now maintain the Real Objective Presence.]

the altar. For they commonly call their evening hymns and prayers by the name of the evening sacrifice.” (Blakeney’s Common Prayer, p. 312.)

It may be added that Bingham declares of the “power to offer Christ’s body and blood REALLY *upon the altar*, as a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead,” that it is “such a notion of the Christian priesthood as NO *ancient author or ritual ever mentions.*” (Antiquities. Book ii., c. xix., Lect. xv., vol. i., p. 269.)

“We with the Ancient Fathers assert and teach, that in the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, among the ancients there was no¹ other oblation made for the Living and the Dead, but only that the Priest and Presbyter standing before the holy Table, prayed to God for them for the sake of Christ, and Christ’s Passion and Death.” (From Bishop Cosin’s notes, communicated by Dr. Pickering, in Nicholls’s Additional Notes, p. 51.)

Courayer quotes from St. Augustine the words “Hujus Sacrificii Caro et Sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur; in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur, post adscensum Christi per *Sacramentum Memoriae* celebratur:” and then he adds (and the statement as coming from a Roman Catholic²

¹ “Blood, *unbloodily* shed? You speak monsters, M. Hart, unless you mean by [unbloodily] not *truly*, and *in deed*, but *sacramentally*. For then you say well, that His blood is shed, when we show His death, and remember the shedding of it. . . . This is the most that you can make of the Fathers, although it be granted that they called their celebrating of the Lord’s Supper an *unbloody sacrifice* in respect of the bloody sacrifice of Christ which He offered on the cross. Much less make they for you, if they called it not so in respect of *His* sacrifice, but of the sacrifice of the Jews. Which is the more likely that they did, because they called their prayers and their very worship of God *unbloody* too: no doubt to distinguish it from the Jewish worship, which offered bloody sacrifices. For as Saint Paul . . . calleth it *reasonable* . . . so the Fathers called it *reasonable and unbloody*, to the same effect.” (Summe of Conference between John Rainolds and John Hart, pp. 537, 538. London, 1598.)

“Suarez the Jesuit denies any proper breaking of the body in the Mass. . . . Besides, the Church of Rome hath left out of her Mass the word (*broken*) used in the Institution; and Jansenius, a Papist, gives the reason why it is left out, *Ne esset locus absurde intelligentiæ, qua quis existimare possit vere frangi Corpus Christi*; that is, lest any should absurdly think, that Christ’s body could be truly broken. And as to any proper shedding of blood in the Eucharist, Bellarmine himself disowns it: saith he, *Sanguis Christi in Missa non reipsa egreditur de corpore*. . . . And this is as much as any Protestant can say, in dissolving this Argument; for if *breaking*, and *shedding of blood* in the Supper, is to be taken improperly, then is the Supper but an improper Figurative Sacrifice, representative of the true proper sacrifice, which we Protestants grant.” (Morning Exercise against Popery, pp. 809, 810. London, 1675.)

² See also Bishop of Condom as quoted in Hickeys’s Treatises, vol. iii., p. 263. “Plerique Pontificii statuunt, *Missam esse sacrificium externum, visibile, proprie sic dictum, adeoque propitiatorium*. Sed Gropperus. . . . Wicelius, Sidonius. . . . *Missam tantum pro repræsentativo et commemorativo sacrificio habendam esse docuerunt.*” (Gerhard’s *Confessio Catholica*, ii., p. 1018. Jena, 1661.)

“Dicunt, *Christi sacrificium non tantum verbis, sed et simili actione, puta Missali sacrificio, quod tamen idem cum crucis sacrificio sit, debere repræsentari*. At si Missa est tantum repræsentatio ac similitudo sacrificii Christi in ara crucis

is most observable), "It is thus that the greater part of the ancient Fathers have expressed themselves. . . . St. Ignatius, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, and so many others, do not acknowledge a Sacrifice in the celebration of our Mysteries in any other sense; which led St. Ambrose to say, that Jesus Christ really offers Himself for us in heaven to His Father, but that upon our altars *He is offered ONLY IN IMAGE: Hic in imagine, ibi in veritate.*" (On English Orders, Oxford Edit., pp. 224, 225. See C. S. Malan's "The Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," pp. 65-109.)

The following is from Bishop Bilson:—"Philander [Jesuit] As though the ancient fathers did not also say that Christ is daily offered in the Church. *Theophilus* [Christian] NOT IN the SUBSTANCE, which is¹

oblatus, quomodo identitas sacrificii crucis et sacrificii Missatici, quam Concilium Tridentinum statuit, locum habebit?" (Ibid. p. 1022.)

¹ "Christ is offered in this Sacred Supper, not Hypostatically, as the Papists would have Him (for so He was but once offered) but *commemoratively* only. . . . That this, and no other, offering of Christ in the blessed Eucharist the Ancient Church ever meant or intended, I am now to shew by authentic Testimonies. . . . In a word, the Sacrifice of Christians is nothing but that one Sacrifice of *Christ*, once offered on the cross, again and again commemorated." (Mede's Works, pp. 376, 378. Edit. 1677.)

"Passio domini est (ut inquit Cyprianus) sacrificium quod offerimus, id est, quod offerendo representamus, memores illius unici et summi sacrificii, et sanctæ immolationis in cruce factæ. Immolatur ergo Christus in altari, sed sacramentaliter et mystice, quia in sacramento recordatio illius fit, quod factum est semel." ("Enchiridion Christianæ institutionis" printed with "Canones Concil: Prov: Coloniensis, sub Reverendiss: D. Hermanno Archiepis: anno 1536." Fo. cvi. a. Colo: 1538.)

"Immolatio quæ manibus sacerdotis fit, Christi passio vocatur, non rei veritate, sed significandi mysterio, nec hac immolatione magis quam esu corporis dominici occiditur Christus." (Ibid. fo. cvi. a.)

"I have already produced the testimonies where the fathers make what is distributed in the Eucharist to be without life or sense, which can be true of nothing else but of the bread and wine. . . . The same is also evidently proved from another common assertion of the fathers, 'that Christ offered the same oblation with Melchizedec.' St. Cyprian, lib. ii., Epist. 3, 'Quis magis sacerdos Dei summi, quam Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit hoc idem quod Melchisedec obtulerat, id est *panem et vinum*, suum scilicet corpus et sanguinem.' *Which indeed the wine and bread was BY REPRESENTATION*; but if you understand this of *proper flesh and blood* offered in the Eucharist, then *it is NOT the same oblation* with that of Melchisedec." (*Full view of the Doctrines and Practices of the Ancient Church relating to the Eucharist*, pp. 101-103, said to be written by Bishop Patrick, see Hicke's Treatises, vol. iii., pp. 263, 264. Angl.-Cath. Lib.)

"Of all the Early Fathers, none, perhaps, are so full and emphatic on the *sacrificial* character of the Eucharist as Cyprian . . . [after quotation]. The purport of this passage is to represent the Eucharist as a *commemorative* sacrifice, and nothing more. And the same is expressed in another paragraph of the same letter still more unequivocally." (Professor J. J. Blunt on the Early Fathers, pp. 461, 462.)

"The Fathers named their offering a sacrifice, not properly but by a figure: meaning the death of Christ (our only very, sovereign, true, and proper sacrifice) to be represented there, in a mystery, not executed in deed. . . . So doth Cyprian treat of the offering of Christ. . . . So doth Chrysostom. . . . So the same Ambrose. . . . So Austin. . . . Finally Eusebius (who may serve also to declare

your ERROR, but in SIGNIFICATION, which is THEIR doctrine and OURS. Take their interpretation with their words, and they make nothing for your local and external offering of Christ. . . . 'What other thing,' saith Prosper, 'is thereby designed, than the offering of the Lord's body on the cross, and the shedding of His blood from His side? . . . Then if the death of Christ be the sacrifice which the Church offereth, it is evident that Christ is not only *sacrificed* at this table, but also *crucified*; and crucified in the self-same sort and sense that He is sacrificed; but no man is so mad as to defend that Christ is *really* put to death in these mysteries: *ergo* neither is He *really* sacrificed under the forms of bread and wine: which thing yourselves have lately ventured and rashly presumed without all antiquity. The Catholic Fathers I can assure you, say, *Christ is offered* and Christ *is crucified* in the Lord's Supper indifferently.'" (Bishop Bilson, True Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion. Edit. 1585, pp. 690, 691.)

"The contradiction of the Trent Fathers is here very remarkable. 'Christ,' say they, 'who, on the altar of the cross, offered Himself in a bloody sacrifice, is now this true propitiatory Sacrifice in the Mass, made by Himself. He is one and the same sacrifice; and one and the same offerer of that sacrifice, by the ministry of His priests, who then offered Himself on the cross.' So then, they say, that Christ offered up that sacrifice then, and this now: St. Paul says He offered up *that sacrifice*, and no more. St. Paul says our High Priest needs not to offer daily sacrifice: they say these daily sacrifices must be offered by Him. St. Paul says, that He offered Himself but once for the sins of the people: they say He offers Himself daily for the sins of quick and dead. And, if the Apostle, in the spirit of prophecy, foresaw this error, and would purposely forestall it, he could not speak more directly, than when he saith, *We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all*, etc., etc.'" (Bishop Hall's Works, vol. ix., p. 259. Edit. Pratt, 1808.)¹

the judgment of the Council of Nice, whereof he was a part) doth by the very name of unbloody sacrifices witness his agreement therein with the rest. For he calleth our remembrances and representations of the death of Christ in celebrating the sacraments of His body and blood, through sacrifices, for the likeness: yet unbloody, for the difference: to show that Christ is not sacrificed in them truly and properly (for then must His blood be shed, as it was, when He suffered death) but only by way of a sacrament, and mystery, wherein the true sacrifice is set forth before us, and remembered by us." (The Summe of the Conference between John Rainolds and John Hart, p. 536. London, 1598.)

"This was one reason why the Ancients called the action a sacrifice . . . because it doth represent the Sacrifice which Christ once offered. It is a figure of His death which we commemorate, unto which the Apostle St. Paul (as a learned man conceives) hath a reference, when he saith to the Galatians, that *Jesus Christ was set forth evidently before their eyes, crucified among them*. They saw (as it were) His Sacrifice on the cross, it was so lively figured in this Sacrament." (Bishop Patrick's Mensa Mystica, p. 14. London, 1717.)

¹ "Christus illic tantum offertur, ubi patitur, sanguinem effundit, moritur: hæc enim æquipollent. Probatur. Nam Paulus Hebr: 9 sic inquit: Neque ut sæpe offerat semetipsum, etc., alioquin oportebat eum frequenter pati ab origine mundi.

Note U, p. 298.

The animus of this change is yet more striking when viewed in connexion with just the same process taking place in the Ordinal. Our Reformers were wont to argue against the Sacrifice of the Mass, from the silence of Scripture, adverting, sometimes, especially to the fact of the Pastoral Epistles containing nothing of what (in the Romish view) is the highest work of the Christian ministry.

We may argue that our Prayer Book is, in this as in other matters also, like the Scriptures. And we may ask of the Prayer Book as a whole, where is one word of the mass, either name or thing? And we may specially advert to our Ordinal, containing a long and very solemn address touching those matters which pertain to the office of the Christian ministry; and ask where is one word of offering sacrifice?

And not only so; but we must direct special attention to the fact that this perfect silence in the Ordinal, like the silence in our Communion Service, comes of the CLEARING WORK of our Reformers. Once that was conspicuously present, which now (thanks to the Reformation) is conspicuously absent. Dr. Blakeney writes:—

“The Mediæval Ordinal contained the following passages. I give the translation:—

“‘It belongeth to a priest *to offer*.’

“How did the Reformers deal with this? They struck it out.

“‘Bless and sanctify, O Lord, these hands of thy priests in the consecration of hosts which they shall offer for the sins and negligences of the people.’

“How did the Reformers deal with this? They struck it out.

“‘Receive power *to offer sacrifice* to God, and to *celebrate Mass* for the living as well as for the dead.’

“How did the Reformers deal with this? They struck it out.

“‘The blessing of God the Father, and the Son, and the Holy

Ergo offerri Christum est pati Christum: nam Paulus Christi oblationem hinc probat unicam esse oportere, quod semel tantum est mactatus. Ergo illic solum offeritur, ubi moritur: nam oblatio mortem sequitur. Tunc enim perficitur oblatio, quum id quod offertur occisum est.

“Christus non potest ultra mori, pati, sanguinem fundere. Ro. 6. Christus qui resurrexit a mortuis, ultra non moritur, mors illi ultra non dominatur, nam quod mortuus est, peccato mortuus est, et hoc semel: quod autem vivit, vivit Deo.

“Ergo Christus ultra offerri non potest, mori enim non potest.

“Nunc te hujus admoneo, ne mihi ulla istarum propositionum inexcussas transilias. Id si feceris, nunquam ex sacramento Eucharistiæ oblationem facies, etiam si patrum testimonia terra marique advehas.”

(“Adversus Hieronymum Emserum Canonis Missæ assertorem Huldrychi Zuinglii Antibolon.” Zurich, Christopher Froshover, 1523. Under “Missa”—“Secundo sic accipe,” i., ii., iii. The book is without pagination.)

“Christus semel se pro nobis *obtulit*: id est, semel pro nobis mortuus est. Nam hoc est offerre, ut Christus oblatus est. Et nos dicimus per manum sacerdotis semper offerri. Quod si verum est, et illud verum esse oportet: Christum per sacerdotis manum semper mori.” (Oswald Myconius, *Ad Sacerdotes Helvetia suasoria*, p. 18; Zurich, 1523.)

Spirit descend upon you, that you may be blessed in the sacerdotal order, and in the offering of propitiatory sacrifices.'

"How did the Reformers deal with this? They struck it out." (Dr. Blakeney, "Mass in the Church of England," p. 20.)

These omissions were made in the Ordinal of 1549, in which, however, was still retained the delivery of the chalice or cup with the bread. (See Liturgies of Edward, P. S. Edit., p. 179.)

In 1552 this was omitted also, and only the delivery of the Bible retained.

Let the exhortation in our Reformed office for "the ordering of Priests" be compared with the "Admonitio ad Sacerdotes" of the Sarum Ordinal, which may be seen in Maskell's Monumenta Ritualia, vol. iii., pp. 233-236.

Our Reformers were fully justified in making these omissions.

In the Eastern Church "it will be specially remarked that there is neither unction of the head nor hands; nor any *traditio instrumentorum*. It also cannot fail to be noticed that there is nothing which strictly corresponds with the 'Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, missasque celebrare, tam pro vivis, quam pro defunctis,' of the Roman Pontifical. The only direct reference to the subject of sacrifice occurs in the prayer, 'O God, mighty in power, and unsearchable in wisdom,' in which the expression is *προσφέρειν σοι δῶρα καὶ θυσίας πνευματικάς*, 'to offer unto Thee gifts and spiritual sacrifices.'" (Dr. F. G. Lee's Validity of Holy Orders, pp. 104, 105.)

"The most ancient forms of ordination which exist, common to both Orientals and Occidentals, are those which simply direct the consecrator to lay on his hands, at the same time that he uses a prayer or prayers supplicating the grace of the Spirit of God on behalf of the person ordained." (Ibid. p. 91.)

"Where has he learnt that the Priesthood is conferred by the formula which expresses the power to sacrifice? There is not a single word said of it in the Ancient Orders of Service, no more than in the Euchologies and Rituals of the Greeks, the Syrians, the Copts, and generally speaking of all the Orientals. On this subject may be consulted the collection of Father Martene, and it will there be seen, that it is only since the eleventh century that we find the formula 'Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Mass as well for the living as for the dead, in the name of the Lord': a formula which has been drawn in only by the ceremony of the Chalice and the Paten; and independently of which the Priests were formerly very validly consecrated in the Latin, and are still at this day in the Eastern Church." (Courayer on English Orders, Oxford Edit., pp. 220, 221. See also, pp. 216, 217, 96, 98, 100, 106, 109-116. And Walcott on English Ordinal, pp. 252-257; also, Blakeney on Common Prayer, pp. 594, 595.)

It has been declared by a Roman Pontiff (Pope Innocent IV.) "formas sacramentorum post Apostolos esse inventas et ab Ecclesiâ ordinatas. De ritu Apostolico invenitur in Epist: ad Timotheum quod manum imponebant ordinandis, et orationem fundebant, aliam

autem formam non legimus ab eis servatam, unde credimus quod nisi essent formæ postea adinventæ, sufficeret ordinatori dicere *sis Sacerdos* vel alia æquipollentia verba: sed subsequentibus temporibus formas quæ servantur Ecclesia ordinavit." (See Du Pin, "De antiquâ Ecclesiæ Disciplinâ," p. 354. Edit. Paris, 1686.)

But the full justification of these omissions, as of the corresponding changes in our Communion Service,¹ rests upon the authority of God's word, by which our Reformers learnt to condemn the sacrifices of Masses as "blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."

"Vos aliud cerebri vestri figmentum adjecistis, potestatem scilicet offerendi sacrificium propriè dictum, et propriè *propitiatorium* pro vivis et defunctis. In qua fieri non potest, ut vos Apostolis succedatis, cum nec ipsi (ut postea liquebit) tales fuerint Sacerdotes, nec ullum unquam istiusmodi Sacerdotium posteris tradiderint." (Mason's *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*. Lib. 2, cap. i., p. 59. Edit. 1625.)

"Primo, panem dedisse legimus, patinam tradidisse non legimus. Secundo, calicem præbuit quidem, sed ab libendum, non, (ut vos) ad sacrificandum. Vestra igitur porrectio in Christi facto fundari non potest. . . . Spiritus Sanctus solius meminit *Impositionis manuum*, neque ullius præterea cærimonix, in Episcoporum ordinatione ab Apostolis adhibitæ, uspiam in Scripturis fit mentio: cum hac tamen manuum impositione gratiam ordinato collatam esse testatur Spiritus sanctus. Hanc igitur, ut signum ordinis sensibilis, et Symbolum gratiæ amplectimur: reliquas vero cærimonias, humano ingenio excogitatas, tanto honore non dignamur: hanc gloriam (quanta quanta est) sola Impositio manuum suo sibi quasi jure vindicat." (Mason's *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, lib. ii., c. 15, p. 218. See also Pearson's *Minor Theological Works*, vol. i., pp. 291-299. Edit. Churton, 1844.)

Note V, see p. 298.

"The blessed Sacrament," says Jeremy Taylor, "is the same thing now as it was in the institution of it; but Christ did not really give

¹ "One thing is certain,—that the more sacrificial the general tenour of any Liturgy is, the more confused and inconsistent with itself it is, and this confusion culminates in the most Sacrificial of all Liturgies, the Roman." (Saddler in "The Church and the Age," p. 293.)

The following are the words of Luther—"Nec quid commodemus illis, vocabulum sacrificium in Canone tolerantes, video, Cum Canon Missam nullo alio vocabulo quam sacrificio depingat atque describat, ita ut omnes oculati videant et fateri cogantur, Missam esse sacrificium. Inter cætera enim, hæc quoque verba expresse ponuntur, ut Deus ejusmodi Sacramenti Sacrificium, per manus Sacrosancti Angeli sui ad thronum et sedem Majestatis Divinæ perferri jubeat, quod licet torqueant, et glossis suis, ut volent, emolliant: tamen intelligi locus iste non potest de memoria aut recordatione Christi, id quod per conciones fieri necesse est. An vero huic blasphemix subscriberemus, quæ in Eodem Canone rogatur et petitur, ut Deus hostiam sanguinis ac carnis Christi gratam habeat, quasi vero Christo apud Patrem suum cœlestem Sacrificuli intercessione et deprecatione opus sit? Quod cum sit dictu et auditu horrendum, quamam conscientia in tam fædam Christi contumeliam consentiremus?" (Luther in "Historia Comitiorum M.D.XXX. Augustæ Celebratorum," Frankfort-on-Oder, 1597, vol. iii., fos. 53, 54.)

His natural body in the natural sense, when He ate His last supper ; therefore, neither does He now. The first proposition is, beyond all dispute, certain, evident, and confessed. *Hoc facite* convinces it. ' *This do* ' : what Christ did, His disciples are to do. I assume Christ did not give His natural body properly in the Last Supper, therefore neither does He now. The assumption I prove by divers arguments.

"First, if He then gave His natural body, then it was naturally broken, and His blood was actually poured forth before His passion. . . . Now these words were spoken either properly and naturally (and then they were not true, because His body was yet whole, His blood still in the proper channels) ; or else it was spoken in a figurative and sacramental sense, and so it was true (as all the words which our blessed Saviour spoke) ; for that which He then ministered was the Sacrament of His passion.

"Secondly, if Christ gave His body in the natural sense at the Last Supper, then it was either a sacrifice propitiatory, or it was not ; —if it was not, then it is not now, and then their dream of the Mass is vanished ; if it was propitiatory at the Last Supper, then God was reconciled to the world, and mankind was redeemed before the passion of our blessed Saviour, which therefore would have been needless and ineffectual ; so FEARFUL ARE THE CONSEQUENCES OF THIS STRANGE DOCTRINE." (Bishop Jeremy Taylor's "Real Presence," Sect. vii., 1 ; vol. vi., pp. 66, 67.)

It was hotly disputed (according to Sarpi) at the Council of Trent, whether or not Christ offered himself in His Supper. One part said He did *not* offer ; "and for proof hereof, they said that the OBLATION OF THE CROSS *would have been SUPERFLUOUS*, because mankind *would have been REDEEMED by that of the Supper*, which went before." (Sarpi, Edit. 1576, p. 510.) The Bishop of Veglia "told them . . . he that maintaineth a *propitiatory sacrifice* in the Supper, must needs confess that BY IT WE ARE REDEEMED, and NOT BY HIS DEATH." This Bishop, we are told, "persuaded so many, that it was almost the common opinion, not to make mention of the *propitiatory sacrifice* offered by Christ in the Supper." (Ibid. p. 519.) When the decree was passed declaring that Christ "*corpus et sanguinem suum sub speciebus panis et vini Deo Patri obtulit*," (Sessio xxii., caput 1,) "three and twenty bishops did contradict." (Ibid. p. 536.)

"It is impossible that the sacrament should be a very sacrifice. For neither the sacrifices of the law which prophesied the sacrificing of Christ, neither yet our redemption, was fulfilled that night. For if the Scriptures and prophecies were then fulfilled, and we then redeemed, Christ died on the morrow in vain. . . . He bled as fresh on the morrow as He had bled then nothing at all. . . . The sacrament was that night, no doubt, but a description of His passion to come ; as it is now a memorial of His passion past." (Tyndale's Doctrinal Treatises, P. S. Edit., p. 371.)

"The suffering which He specified by the breaking of His body and shedding of His blood was not present, but the next day on the cross. If you teach that Christ's blood was really shed at the table

for the remission of sins, you must put Him twice to death, and make the later death which was on the cross to be utterly idle. For where remission (of sin) is, there needeth no more sacrifice for sin. If the remission of sins were obtained by the actual shedding of Christ's blood at His last supper, His death and cross the next day were superfluous." (Bishop Bilson's "True Difference," etc., p. 676. Edit. 1585.)

"Their Jesuit Salmeron is permitted to write, that *the oblation of Christ in His last supper* (which the Romanists hold to have been *satisfactory* and propitiatory)¹ *did not receive any efficacy or virtue from the sacrifice of the Cross.*" (Bishop Morton's "Catholic Appeal," lib. ii., ch. 7, sect. 17, p. 187. Edit. 1610.)

"You say we have renounced your sacrifice of the Mass. If the sacrifice of the Mass be the same with the sacrifice of the Cross, we attribute more unto it than yourselves; we place our whole hope of salvation in it. . . . 'By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.' Surely you cannot think that Christ did actually sacrifice Himself at His Last Supper (for then He had redeemed the world at His Last Supper; then His subsequent sacrifice upon the cross had been superfluous); nor that the priest now doth more than Christ did then." (Archbishop Bramhall: Works, Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. i., p. 54.)

"Christ himself did not sacrifice on the table, but on the cross: for, if the sacrifice which He offered in His Supper were perfect and fully propitiatory, what needed He to die afterward? Wherefore was His blood shed upon the Cross, which (by His transubstantiated blood, not yet shed) had formerly redeemed the world? . . . What can either be spoken or conceived, more plain than those words of God, *once offered, one sacrifice, one oblation*? . . . We will remember

¹ Dr. George Hickes says of Prayer "that is propitiatory too" (Treatises, vol. i., p. 109, Ang.-Cath. Lib.); and so Cassander had spoken. (See Ibid. vol. lii., p. 278.) But such language, it seems to me, (*used in such connexion*) can only tend to make confusion in men's minds, and to draw together in men's conceptions things which are (and should always be regarded as) as far distant as heaven from earth. If propitiation is a reality, which for its making demanded the Death and Blood-shedding of the Son of God, why should we desire to stretch the meaning of a word which belongs properly to His work (in its shadow before its accomplishment, but since in its reality alone) so as to cover and overlap the doings or offerings or cryings of the sinful and polluted worms of earth?

Bishop Bull says—"The meaning of it [the Trent proposition] must necessarily be this, that in the Eucharist the very body and blood of Christ are again offered up to God as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men. Which is an impious profanation, derogatory to the one full satisfaction of Christ made by His death on the cross, and contrary to express Scripture. (Heb. vii. 27; ix. 12, 15, 26, 28; x. 12, 14.) It is true the Eucharist is frequently called by the ancient fathers *προσφορά*, *θυσία*, 'an oblation,' 'a sacrifice.' But it is to be remembered, that they say also it is *θυσία λογική καὶ ἀναίμακτος*, 'a reasonable sacrifice,' 'a sacrifice without blood:' which, how can it be said to be, if therein the very blood of Christ were offered up to God?" (See Hickes's Treatises, vol. iii., p. 267; Angl.-Cath. Lib. And Bull's Works, vol. ii., p. 251. Oxford, 1846. See also Veron, as quoted in "Is Healthful Reunion Impossible?" pp. 88, 89.)

this holy sacrifice of Christ, as Cassander well advises, and celebrate it with a thankful heart: we will not repeat it." (Bishop Hall: Works, vol. ix., p. 67. Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

"That which Cassander cites: . . . 'Surely, if we offer daily, it is done for a recordation of His death.' This is the language and meaning of antiquity." (Ibid. p. 258.)

"But further—did our Saviour at His first Sacrament really offer up Himself—body and blood and life—a true, proper sacrifice to God, or did He not? If He did not, how shall we dare to pretend to offer Him up in our sacraments? If He did, as the Papists say He did, to what purpose did He afterwards offer himself up upon the cross?" (Archbishop Sharp's Works, Edit. Oxford, 1829, vol. v., p. 199.)

"Christ can be no more offered, as the doctors and priests of the Roman party fancy it to be, and vainly think that every time they say Mass they offer up and sacrifice Christ anew, as properly and truly as He offered up Himself in His sacrifice upon the cross. And this¹ is one of the points of doctrine, and the CHIEF ONE, whereof the *Popish Mass* consisteth, ABROGATED and REFORMED *here by the Church of England*, according to the express word of God. . . . Without shedding of His blood, and killing Him over again, no proper sacrifice can be made of Him; which yet in their Masses the Roman priests pretend every day to do."² (Notes "supposed to be made

¹ This is no question at all of whether or not the Church of Rome thinks or acknowledges her doctrine to be derogatory to the Sacrifice of the Cross.

Did any one ever suppose that she *professed* to teach that which would make void the Saviour's work? Whoever expected her to plead *guilty* to such a charge?

But it is a question of whether or not the doctrine of the Church of Rome *does* derogate from the one perfect sacrifice of Christ.

Neither is it at all a question of whether or not her doctrine has been explained away by some and disclaimed by others among her Theologians.

But it is a question of whether or not the Romish doctrine of Sacrifice of the Mass *in its integrity*, and the Scriptural doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Cross *in its integrity* can stand together without collision, can be accepted and held together without being mutually destructive.

Whatever answer may be given to *this* question in our day, there can be no doubt as to the answer which our Reformers gave: and as little, I think, *should* there be as to the answer which our Church gives.

To say that the doctrine condemned by our Church in Article xxxi., cannot be the real Romish doctrine, because the doctrine *there* condemned is a doctrine derogatory to the Sacrifice of the Cross, is obviously to beg the whole question. Nay, is it not much more, is it not much the same as saying that we are looking at the Romish doctrine from her own point of view, and not from that of our Reformed Church? Proposals for Peace, from such a stand-point, we may not listen to.

"For us," says Bishop Hall, "as we would save our souls, let us carefully preserve them from the contagion of Romish superstition. Let us never fear, that our discretion can hate error too much. Let us awaken our holy zeal to a serious and fervent opposition, joined with a charitable endeavour of reclamation.

"Shortly, let us hate their opinions, strive against their practice, pity their misleading, neglect their censures, labour their recovery, pray for their salvation." (Bishop Hall's Works, vol. ix., p. 300. Edit. Pratt, 1808.) See "Word for Warning and Defence of the Church of England," pp. 24 and 29. (Macintosh.)

² "The Catholic Fathers," writes Bishop Bilson, "say Christ is offered and Christ is crucified in the Lord's Supper indifferently." (True Difference, p. 691.)

from the Collections of Bishop Overall, by a Friend or Chaplain of his," in Nicholls's Additional Notes, p. 46; really Bishop Cosin's.)

Herbert Thorndike says—"When it is said there [in the Council of Trent, cap. ii.], '*Quod in Missa . . . Christus . . . incruentè immolatur*,'—if it be meant properly, it is a contradiction; for that *which hath blood* is NOT SACRIFICED *but by shedding the blood of it*;—if figuratively, it signifies no more than that which I have said,—that it is represented, commemorated, and offered, as slain." (Thorndike's Works, Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. v., p. 615.)

It is said by Gaspar Contarini that we *offer* CHRIST and we *offer* HIS PASSION. His words are—"Missa est sacrificium laudis, est sacrificium gratiarum actionis, est sacrificium, quia est memoria unci illius sacrificii, quo Christus se pro nobis obtulit patri, per Spiritum Sanctum, est autem sacrificium, quia est oblatio, *qua offerimus Christum, ejusque passionem*, ut inquit Augustinus in decimo de civitate Dei, et totam Ecclesiam per Christum Deo omnipotenti, ut ei inhæreamus per Christum, tanquam supremo omnium bono." (Gaspar Contarini's *Catechesis*, in Works, p. 536; Paris, 1571.)

Now if this offering of Christ in the Eucharist is in such sense *real* (and *not only representative*), that for this offering of Christ it is needful that His *body and blood* should be *present REALLY* (and *not only representatively*), then it follows that for the offering of His *Passion*, that *Passion* must also be *present REALLY* (and *not only representatively*).

But "the act of sacrificing Christ upon the Cross . . . is a thing consisting of motion and action; and can be *no more repeated, than the present time can become the present time another time*." (Herbert Thorndike's Works, Edit. Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. v., p. 547.)

Yet it is not easy to see how the following out of the Romish doctrine of the Mass, and of the Romish principles of interpretation on which that doctrine rests, can be made to stop short of this.

"By this doctrine, Christ's body was really and actually dead upon the cross, and so present under the accidents of bread and wine, when at the first Institution and Administration of the Lord's Supper He said, '*This is my body given or broken for you*.' And also . . . His body must be dead upon the Cross, and as so dead must be locally and corporally present in the Lord's Supper. . . . Moreover, it must also follow from this doctrine, that the very material Cross on which Christ was crucified, and all the Instruments of His death, must be locally and corporally present at the Lord's Supper, and the very soldier that pierced Him must be there: . . . yea, the very hour of His Death, though so many years past, and the place of His death, so many miles distant, must be present in every time and place the Lord's Supper is administered." ("Morning Exercise against Popery," p. 739; London, 1675.)

Even *some such* contradictions as these (or something very like them), rejected and repudiated by Romanists themselves (however deducible from their teaching), appear to have been accepted by some, at least, of the Lutherans; who even regarded their denial by Papists as only defensible upon Zuinglian principles, and as being in fact a real support to Zuinglian arguments and to the cause of the Sacramentaries.

Witness the following:—"Quod in decimo articulo dixerunt, si modo inibi factum est, corpus Christi sine sanguine et sanguinem sine corpore esse non posse, plane est rejiciendum ac repudiandum, si quidem nugæ et fabulæ ipsorum cum primo fidei nostræ articulo, qui *Deum omnipotentem* adserit et confitetur, manifeste et ex diametro pugnant.

"Deus igitur cum sit omnipotens corpus sine sanguine, et sanguinem sine corpore nobis præbere potest, vivo nihilominus Christo, et salva corporis ac sanguinis ejus substantia.

"Secundo, Zuinglii et Carolostadii errorem hoc ipso confirmant. Si enim caro sanguisque Christi distinctè in cœna nobis offerri et exhiberi non possunt, *multo minus simul et semel in diversis locis esse poterunt*, si quidem *multo magis naturæ*

"Turning to the explanation of the Article [Art. xxxi.] given in Tract 90, and lately repeated by Mr. Medd and Mr. Stuart, by the former in somewhat different terms, according to which the Article was pointed at a popular misapprehension as to the nature of the sacrifice, I think that the common prevalence of such an error, especially as it is described by Mr. Medd, has been too hastily assumed without proof, which perhaps it would be difficult to produce. But it is more important to observe that Mr. Newman, when he had spoken of the Mass 'being viewed as independent or distinct from the Sacrifice on the cross,' appears to treat these two expressions, 'independent of' and 'distinct from,' as synonymous, and as conveying a meaning which he calls 'blasphemy.' But there is a very wide difference between the two things. To view the Mass as 'independent of the Sacrifice of the cross,' would indeed be a very gross error; but until I see some proof, I shall continue utterly to disbelieve that it is one into which any worshipper at the Mass, even in the darkest ages, ever fell. But though not independent of, it might be viewed as distinct from, the Sacrifice on the cross; and so *it is* viewed, not by the ignorant and vulgar only, but by the Church of Rome. . . . However correct Mr. Stuart may be in his view of what the Eucharist Sacrifice should be, to avoid direct collision with the Thirty-first Article, he is certainly mistaken, if, when he says 'there is a real propitiatory sacrifice, *i.e.* victim, in the Eucharist, but there is no real *act* of propitiation,' he conceives himself (as the whole context appears to show) to be expounding and not directly contradicting the Roman doctrine of the Mass. For when, in Canon 1, De Sacrificio Missæ, the Council of Trent declares—'Si quis dixerit in Missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium, aut quod offerri non sit aliud quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari anathema sit'—it is certain that *sacrificium* does not mean the *victim*, but the *act*—the same act which in Canon iii. is declared to be an 'act of propitiation': 'Si quis dixerit, Missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti [only a memorial] non autem propitiatorium

est contrarium, simul et semel in diversis locis esse, quam hoc, quod nobis corpus solum et sanguis solus distribuat." ("Apologia Osiandri contra Articulos a Pontificiis Exhibitos," in "Cælestini Historia Comitiorum MDXXX. Augustæ Celebratorum," vol. iii., fo. 86 b; Frankfort-on-Oder, 1597.)

Those who are disposed to think that in such matters of faith God is exalted, and His word made honourable, by refusing to allow the evidence of our senses, and the intuitions of our common sense, to have any part whatever in the interpretation of the language of Scripture, may be asked to observe—

(1) How the Lord Himself has consecrated the evidence of our senses (and that in the very matter of His bodily presence), when He said, "Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." (See Goulburn on Office of the Holy Communion, p. 292.)

(2) How, in like manner, the testimony of our common sense (and that as to the very matter of the impossibility of the human body of Christ being in more than one place at one time) is assumed and consecrated by Revelation, in such words as those which declared, "He is not here, *for* He is risen;" "Ye have the poor always with you, but me ye have not always."

anathema sit.'” (Bishop of St. David’s Charge, 1866, pp. 139, 140, 142, 143.)

Bellarmino distinctly says:—“Non res illa, sed *rei illius oblatio* propriè sacrificium est; sacrificium enim est *actio*, non res permanens.” (De Missa, lib. ii., cap. iv., p. 1054; Edit. Ingolstadt, 1601. See also p. 1036, lib. i., cap. xxvii.)

Mr. Saddler, therefore, is quite right, (I think) when he says “The Real Objective Presence may add intensity to the memorial act, but nothing to the idea of Sacrifice. A sacrifice is not a thing merely, no matter how precious or holy, but an action performed on that thing as well.” (The Church and the Age, p. 279. See Forbes on Articles, vol. ii., pp. 615, 616.)

Note W, p. 298.

“Nowhere do the Apostles or the Apostolic Fathers use the term *ιερεύς* for ¹ priest in the Holy Catholic Church, but only *πρεσβύτερος*: and in this case the so-called APOSTOLIC LITURGIES are UTTERLY WORTHLESS as an authority. Even in the so-called Apostolic Canons, priests are never called *ιερείς*, but *πρεσβύτεροι*. . . . The Apostolic Liturgies of S. Peter, S. Matthew, S. John, etc., and that of S. James in particular, are quoted for the terms *ιερεύς* and *θυσία* found there; but no one can place any faith in them, as they have been so inter-

¹ “The word [Priest] must yet have two meanings: the one *πρεσβύτερος*, the other of *ιερεύς*. Whereof the one is given by the Apostles: but doth not imply authority to sacrifice. The other doth imply authority to sacrifice: but is not given by the Apostles.” (The Summe of the Conference between John Rainolds and John Hart, p. 464: London, 1598.)

“So exceedingly moderate and prudent was the Church, that in the seventh Canon, 1640, it abundantly cautions, lest those words [*priest and altar*] be used otherwise than in a *metaphorical and improper* attribution.” (Puller’s Moderation of the Church of England, p. 172; Edit. Eden.) “In Liturgia Anglicana habemus quidem Sacrificii nomen, offerendi verbum, etiam hostiæ mentionem, sed nihil magis adversatur Missatico sacrificio quam tota hæc oratio.” (Ibid.; Quotation from Rivet in Note.)

“We shall not find in all the Holy Scriptures, that the ministers of the New Testament be called either *Sacerdotes* or *Sacrifici*. For that is attributed wholly and only unto Christ. . . . *Objectio*.—The priesthood after the fashion of Melchizedech is now extant. . . . *Responsio*.—The history of the book of Genesis doth not record that Melchizedech offered bread and wine unto God, but that he brought forth bread and wine unto Abraham. . . . St. Ambrose doth evidently say, that these things were offered to Abraham, and not unto God.” (Bishop Alley’s “Poor Man’s Library,” tom. ii., pp. 36 b, 37 a; Edit. Day, 1565.)

“Whatsoever the Scripture speaketh of sacrifices by the Church now in the time of the Gospel, it maketh them spiritual. . . . Therefore away with all real offerings never mentioned by the Lord since the only sufficient sacrifice of His Son. . . . The Mass casteth upon our Saviour the reproach that He is NOT the ONLY PRIEST of the New Testament which so expressly taught of Him. (Heb. v. 6; vii. 24.) . . . They say it is Christ that they offer, and yet they pray God to accept it; which is absurd. No Priest can do more in sacrificing for our sins than Christ did. But Christ could not offer Himself *without death*. Therefore no priest can do it.” (Bishop Babington’s Works, vol. ii., pp. 255, 256; London, 1615.)

polated as to leave¹ *little of the original writing.*" (Malan's Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper—Nutt, p. 106. See also Trevor's Sacrifice and Participation, pp. 141-144. Also Blakeney's Common Prayer, pp. 310-317; and especially the quotation from Du Pin, pp. 324-326. And "Goode on Eucharist," i., p. 439, sqq. Also Faber's Difficulties of Romanism, Appendix, No. 1, pp. 517-529; Edit. 1830.)

"In the terms ἐπίσκοπος, 'bishop,' literally 'overseer,' and πρεσβύτερος, 'elder,' by which the presiding class in the Church is formally designated in Scripture, we find the strongest possible argument against the sacrificial doctrine in question. These titles were selected, the one from a civil office, the other from the synagogue or Sanhedrim—both from an exclusively lay source—as if on purpose to guard against the persons invested with them being confused with the Jewish priests. It matters little, however, whether we regard these terms in the meaning suggested by the sources from which they were borrowed, or in that suggested by themselves. In either case, they form the same continual protest against the doctrine of a sacrifice in the Holy Communion, involving the necessity of an order of priests (ιερείς) for the purpose of offering it. And I think that the argument supplied by these words may be submitted to be itself decisive of the whole question." (Harris's Claims of the Priesthood, Parker, pp. 36, 37.)

The following quotation is worthy of special attention:—"The Apostles did indeed forbear such terms in their speeches concerning Christian worship, whereof these your forenamed disputers can give us a reason, *Lest that (they say) the Jewish Priesthood being as yet in force, Christians might seem by using Jewish terms, to innovate Jewish rites.* Which is enough to show that you are persuaded they abstained from the use of these words *for some reason.* Yet that *this* could not be the reason, you may be sufficiently instructed in the word *Baptism*, this being as fully *Jewish*, as was either the word *Priest*, *Altar*, or *Temple*; and yet used of the Apostle without danger of innovation of the *Jewish* manner of *Baptisms*. Yea, and if the Apostles had thought the *Altar*, *Priest*, *Sacrifice*, to be *essential parts* of Christian religion, they *neither would nor OUGHT to have concealed*

¹ Dr. Daniel concludes his dissertation on the date of the *writing* of Liturgies, by saying, "Itaque ex Liturgiis scriptis, quæ ætatem tulerunt, ne antiquissimæ quidem superant sæculum quintum et quartum. At cave confundas quod bene est distinguendum, aliud sane esse liturgiam componere, aliud eam literis consignare." (Codex Liturgicus, tom. iv., Fasciculus i., p. 31; Leipsic, 1853.)

"Primis Ecclesiæ sæculis sacros illos ritus sola traditione viguissse, extra controversiam esse debet." (Renaudot: Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio, tom. i., Dissertatio, p. iii.)

Again.—"Si non certo, saltem verisimiliter concluditur, ante Basilii tempora Liturgias Græcas literis non fuisse consignatas." (Ibid. p. ix. See also pp. xxx.-xxxviii.)

"Preces ipsæ Liturgicæ quum plerumque sub initium saltem nascentis Ecclesiæ non tam conceptis verbis, quam divino adflante numine ab Apostolis funderentur, non eadem semper temporis mensura contineri poterant." (Zaccharia: "Bibliotheca Ritualis," vol. i., dissertatio i., cap. ii., p. xx.; Rome, 1776. See below, pp. 377, 378.)

the words and names, lest thereby they might have seemed to have abhorred the *proper characters* of our Christian profession." (Morton on Eucharist, bk. vi., ch. 5, sect. 15, pp. 461, 462; Edit. 1635. See Hickee's Treatises, Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. ii., p. 245, sqq.)

Note X, p. 299.

Dr. Brett says of the Oblation, "That it is OMITTED in the Communion Office of the Church of England, is EVIDENT to all that are acquainted with that liturgy; and that it was NOT *casually*, but WILFULLY, left out there, is NO LESS EVIDENT." And again he says, "The words, 'to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' . . . as they are now placed in the post-communion *can by no means be applied to the material elements; for it is absurd to pretend that we may offer to God that which is not, or present to him that which we have eaten and consumed.* . . . This omission and transposition could not be made otherwise than with design." (See Goode's Rule of Faith, vol. ii., p. 362.)

Dr. Blakeney says of the first thanksgiving after Communion, "This is the only prayer which refers to sacrifice, but this cannot refer to the elements, and, moreover, IT NEED NOT BE USED AT ALL, the minister having his choice of this or the next, which, in itself proves that it cannot refer to the sacrifice of the elements, for, in that case it would be *essential* to the service! It is a fact which can not be got over, that the Church of England expunged the words which contained an offering of the body of Christ. There are no such words in our service." (Blakeney on Common Prayer, p. 422.)

"This cannot be properly an oblation or outward and unbloody sacrifice, because this prayer is put after the Communion, to be a thanksgiving and spiritual sacrifice of praise to God for the blessings of the Communion received.

"The Church of England in her reformed Liturgy (we offer ourselves, souls and bodies, etc.) may truly and boldly say that in this, she hath far exceeded their Canon of their Mass, in which there is not one syllable that mentions the sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies, which is the only thing that God calls and looks for at our hands, and in Christ our Head is most pleasing; nay, more, only pleasing to him, and in our power to offer properly. We deny not the daily sacrifice of the Church, which is the Church itself. We take not upon us to sacrifice the natural body of Christ, otherwise than by commemoration, which, once offered by Himself, purchased eternal redemption all sufficient; and therefore not to be offered again and often. But we offer Christ's mystical body—the Church—ourselves, souls and bodies, which is the daily sacrifice of Christ's body (mystical), and warranted by Scripture and Fathers, etc.' Bishop Buckeridge, in Sermon on Heb. xiii. 16, at the funeral of Bishop Andrewes." (MSS. notes in interleaved Prayer Book in British Museum. Among the Harleian MSS., No. 7311.)

"We offer up ourselves, we offer up our prayers, and praises, and

ourselves ; and all these we offer up in the virtue and consideration of Christ's sacrifice, represented before us by way of remembrance and commemoration ; nor can it be proved that the ancients did more than this. This whole service was their Christian sacrifice, and this is ours. But the Romanists have invented a new sacrifice, which Christ never instituted, which the Apostles never dreamt of, which the primitive Christians would have abhorred, and which we, if we will be followers of them, ought never to join in." (Archbishop Sharp's Works ; Edit. Oxford, 1829, vol. v., pp. 196, 197.)

Note Y, p. 299.

The extract is from Mr. Joseph Bardsley's Lecture in "Truths for the Times" (Hunt, pp. 92-94). The following is from the Charge of the Bishop of St. David's, 1866, pp. 94-96 :—

"The difference is marked by their several names and descriptions. The one is an Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion ; the other for the celebration of a sacrifice. The difference indicated by the titles is equally conspicuous in the contents of the two liturgies. In the Anglican, the idea which is most exclusively predominant is that of the Communion. There is indeed an offertory, and an oblation of common things for sacred and charitable uses. There is mention of a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving which appears to include the whole rite ; and the communicants 'offer and present themselves, their souls and bodies, as a living sacrifice.' But of any other kind of sacrifice, and particularly of any sacrificial oblation of the consecrated elements, there is not a word. The consecration is immediately followed by the Communion, which is the great business of the whole. On the other hand, the Council of Trent pronounces an anathema on those who say that there is not offered to God in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice, or that the offering consists only in Christ's being given to us for manducation ; or that the sacrifice of the Mass is only one of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice performed on the cross, and not propitiatory. A more direct conflict of views, if they are supposed to relate to the same subject, or to two subjects not essentially different from one another, it would be difficult to conceive ; for that which the Council emphatically denies to be the sacrifice of the Mass, is the only thing to which our Church gives the name of *her* sacrifice. That which the Council declares to be the true and proper sacrifice of the Mass, is an offering as to which our Church is absolutely silent.

"It might have seemed to anyone who read our Communion Office, a strange and hopeless undertaking to bring it into harmony with the Mass ; and I think that the Ritualists who have made the attempt, have failed to produce anything more than a deceptive show of resemblance, but of the harmony between their own views and those of the Church of Rome in this respect, they have given the most unequivocal signs. The rite which they celebrate they describe

as the Sacrifice of the Altar or the Mass. The splendour with which they invest it is certainly more appropriate to the oblation of a sacrifice than to the reception and participation of a gift. And, feeling that this would still be insufficient for the purpose, they interpolate our Office with large extracts from the Canon of the Mass, in which the sacrifice is explicitly announced, and which the 'celebrant' is directed to use as private prayers. I must own that there is something in this adulteration,—as I think I may not improperly term it,—of the Prayer Book out of the Missal, which to my sense has an unpleasant savour of artifice¹ and disingenuousness. It is a proceeding of which I think both Churches have reason to complain: the one, that her mind is not only disregarded, but misrepresented; the other, that her treasures are rifled to set off her adversary with a false semblance of likeness to herself."

Note Z, p. 299.

"The sacrifice which Christ offered up on the cross for the sins of the world we believe with all our hearts, and reverence with all our might: accounting the same to be PERFECT without *wanting*, ETERNAL without *renewing*, and this is our SOVEREIGN sacrifice. The Lord's table, which He himself ordered to be the memorial of His death and passion, we keep and continue in that manner and form that He first prescribed, and this *may be called*, and *is* a sacrifice, both in respect of the thanks there given to God for the redemption of man, and the bloodshedding of our Saviour *expressed* and *resembled* in that mystery. More than this no Catholic father ever taught, and less than this our Churches do not receive." (Bishop Bilson's True Difference, p. 5. Edit. 1585. See also p. 699.)

"Epistola igitur ad Heb. a Sacrificio Christi Iterationem, utpote imperfectionis argumentum, plane removet. *Et cum sciamus Christum suscitatum a mortuis non amplius mori*, Rom. vi. 9, hinc abundè constat Sacrificium ejus repeti non posse, atque adeo non posse dari in Ecclesiâ Sacrificium, quod cum Sacrificio in cruce oblato *specie idem sit, vel tale essentialiter* quale illud fuit, vel de quo et Sacrificio Crucis univocè Sacrificium prædicetur." (From Notes supposed to be from the Collections of Bishop Overall in Nicholls's Additional Notes, p. 46, really Bishop Cosin's from Calixtus. See Cosin's Works, Ang.-Cath. Libr., vol. v., p. 334.)

"It [the Eucharistic sacrifice] was then [in the ancient Church] believed to be an *ἀνάμνησις*, or *commemoration*, by the symbols of bread and wine, of the body and blood of Christ, once offered up to God on the cross for our redemption; it could not therefore be then thought an offering up again to God of *the very body and blood of*

¹ These, no doubt, are strong expressions. Whether or not such language is justified by the circumstances, I prefer to leave for others to determine. A friend, whose judgment I value, writes—"So it would certainly be regarded in the business transaction of men of the world: and how can we that are spiritual assume such an appearance of evil to be guiltless?"

Christ, SUBSTANTIALLY PRESENT under the appearance of bread and wine ; for these two notions are inconsistent, and cannot stand together. The ancient doctors, yea and Liturgies of the Church, affirm the Eucharist to be *incruentum sacrificium*, 'a sacrifice without blood ;' which it cannot be said to be, if the very blood of Christ were therein present and offered up to God. In the Clementine Liturgy, the bread and wine in the Eucharist are said to be *antitypa*, 'correspondent types,' figures, and images of the precious body and blood of Christ. And divers others of the Fathers speak in the same plain language." (Bishop Bull, "Corruptions of the Church of Rome," sect. 3, vol. ii., pp. 254-5. Edit. Oxford, 1846.)

"In the Eucharist then, Christ is offered, NOT HYPOSTATICALLY, as the Trent Fathers have determined (for so He was but once offered) but COMMEMORATIVELY ONLY ; and this commemoration is made to God the Father, and is not a bare remembering, or putting OURSELVES in mind of Him." (Ibid. p. 252.)

"No one is so blind as not to see the difference between a *proper offering*, which was once performed by His death on the cross, and between an *improper offering*, which is now made either in heaven, by that His appearance on our behalf, or here on earth by Prayers and Representation, or Obtestation or Commemoration, *there being ONLY the same COMMON NAME* for these, but a VERY WIDE DIFFERENCE in the things themselves. . . . There is no form or reason of the Oblation given, which can be *univocally* predicated of THAT ; for upon the cross the Oblation was made by a true Destruction and Death of the live-thing, *without which no Sacrifice PROPERLY so called can be*. But in our Eucharist, there is a Sacrifice made by Prayers, a commemoration, and a Representation, which is NOT PROPERLY a Sacrifice. But nothing hinders, but that the Eucharist may be accounted and called the *Commemorative* Sacrifice of the PROPER SACRIFICE of the Death of Christ ; which our Lord Himself hath taught us, when He said, *This do in remembrance of Me*." (From Notes collected by Bishop Cosin, communicated by Dr. Pickering in Nicholls's Additional Notes to Common Prayer, pp. 50, 51. See correspondence of Marriott and Carter—Rivingtons, Part ii., p. 99.)

Bishop Bilson says :—"Indeed this hath been not the least of Satan's sleights in conveying your religion from step to step, and point by point, to *keep the speech, and change the sense* of the learned and ancient Fathers." (Bishop Bilson's True Difference. Edit. 1585, p. 688, see especially p. 702.)

"You shall find how the ancient Fathers doubted not to say that *Christ suffereth, is slain, slayeth Himself, suffereth often in this Sacrament* : and that *His Passion and Bloody Sacrifice is offered herein*. . . . What think you of such sayings ? Can Christ be said to be *Dead* in this Sacrament ? *Never any Catholic said so* (saith your Jesuit Ribera). What then could be the meaning of such words ? If you should be ignorant, your Cardinal Alan would teach you, and he would have you observe what he saith : *Christ is said by the Fathers to suffer* (saith he) *and to die in this Sacrament ONLY SO FAR*

as His Death and Passion is COMMEMORATED and REPRESENTED *herein*: And so speaketh your Roman Gloss. What now hindereth but that whensoever we hear the same Fathers affirming that the same *Body and Blood* of Christ are *sacrificed* in the Eucharist, we understand them in the same impropriety of speech, that they meant only *Representatively*? . . . The Fathers, as they say that *Christ is Dead, and suffereth* (as you now object) in this Sacrament IN A MYSTERY: so have they also said of His Body, in respect of the Eucharist, *It is Sacrificed in an Image, in a Sacrament, in Mystery*; according to that their general qualification, saying *It is the same sacrifice which Christ offered, or rather a REMEMBRANCE THEREOF.*" (Morton on Eucharist, Book vi., chap. 5, sect. xi., pp. 455, 456, 457. Edit. 1635.)

"As when the day of Christ's Passion (saith he [St. Augustine]) being to-morrow, or the day of His Resurrection about to be the next day but one: we use to say of the former, *To-morrow is Christ's Passion*; and of the other, *When it cometh, it is Christ's Resurrection, yet will none be so absurd as to say, we lie in so saying, because we speak it BY WAY OF SIMILITUDE: even so when we say, THIS IS SACRIFICED, etc.* So St. Augustine. Who now seeth not, that as the Burial of Christ is not the subject matter of *Baptism*, but only the *Representative object* thereof; and as *Good Friday*, and *Easter Day*, are not properly the days of Christ His *Passion* or *Resurrection*, but *Anniversary*, and *Representative*, or *Commemorative* Resemblances of them: so this *sacrifice* is a *SIMILITUDE* of the Sacrifice of Christ on the *Cross*, and not materially the same." (Morton on Eucharist: Book vi., chap. 5, sect. 4, p. 442. Edit. 1635.)

"An unbloody sacrifice . . . can be no other than figurative and commemorative: is it really propitiatory? *without shedding of blood is no remission* (Heb. ix. 22.) If, therefore, sins be remitted by this sacrifice, it must be in relation to that blood, which was shed in the true personal sacrifice upon the cross: and what relation can be betwixt this and that, but of representation and remembrance? in which their moderate Cassander fully resteth." (Bishop Hall's Works: vol. ix., p. 259. Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

"In the Christian Church there is only one proper sacrifice which our Lord offered upon the Cross; and, consequently, Christians cannot partake of any sacrifice in a literal and strict sense, without allowing transubstantiation: lest, therefore, they should want the same pledge to assure them of the Divine favour which the Jews enjoyed, our Lord appointed the Elements of bread and wine to signify His body and blood offered in sacrifice; whence they are expressly called His body and blood, it being common for representatives to bear the name of those things or persons which they represent." (Archbishop Potter on Church Government, p. 184. Edit. Crosthwaite, 1845.)

Note AA, p. 301.

"The effect of this alteration, as regarded impanation, was clearly pointed out by Dr. Scott, Bishop of Chester, in 1559, in a speech

delivered by him 'in the Parliament house against the bill of the Liturgy,' or for Uniformity of Common Prayer. 'The Doctors of the Church,' he said, 'affirm that an intention to do that which Christ did, *i.e.* to consecrate His body and blood, is a circumstance of absolute necessity. For this purpose the Church hath appointed certain prayers in the canon of the mass to be said before the consecration; the words are these, "Ut fiat nobis Corpus et Sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi," *i.e.* that the elements may be made unto us the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. There the intention of the Church and of the priest officiating is plainly declared; but in this new book there is neither any such intention declared nor any petition put up to God for that purpose. The contrary does rather appear by these words in their office, "that we receiving this thy creatures of bread and wine may, etc.," which words declare they intend nothing of consecration. And if so let them value themselves as they please upon their communion, it is to no manner of purpose, in regard the body of Christ is not there, which, as I have already observed, is the thing which should be communicated.'" (Principles at Stake, pp. 153-4.)

The change had been urged by Bucer. "In the Prayer of Consecration he [Bucer] would have these words of blessing and sanctifying the bread and wine, that they might be made to us the body and blood of Christ, changed into these of blessing and sanctifying us, that with true Faith we might receive the body and blood of Christ in these holy Mysteries, as heavenly Food. To which purpose they were afterwards altered, because the former Words (as he said) gave occasion, to confirm Men in Popish Conceit of Transubstantiation; and because we had no Precept nor Example from the Apostles to make any such Prayer for the blessing of the bread, etc." (Bishop Cosin in Nicholls's additional Notes to Common Prayer, p. 53. See "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 618. See also Bucer's *Scripta Anglicana*.)

Geste, giving the reasons to Cecil, why the Committee of Divines (reviewing the Prayer Book under Elizabeth) had not adopted the Consecration Prayer of the *first* Book of Edward, says, "This prayer is to be disliked for two causes,—The first, because it is taken to be so needful for the conservation that the conservation is not thought to be without it. Which is not true. . . . Gregory writeth to the bishop of Syracuse that the Apostles used only the Lord's prayer at the Communion, and none other. . . . Justine, in showing how the Communion was celebrated in his time, maketh no mention of invocation; no more doth Irenee. The second cause, why the foresaid prayer is to be refused is, for that it prayeth that the bread and wine may be Christ's body and blood, which maketh for the Popish transubstantiation, which is a doctrine that hath caused much idolatry. And though the doctors so speak, yet we must speak otherwise, because we take them otherwise than they meant, or would be taken. For, when their *meaning* is *corrupted*, then their words must be *expounded*." (In Dugdale's Life, pp. 147-8.)

It has been argued that the passage in Gregory referred to by Geste is corrupt. (See Maskell's "Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England," Pref., p. xxii.) The statement, however, is not disputed by Bellarmine.¹ (De Missâ, Lib. i., cap. xxvii., De Controvers: vol. iii., pp. 1036, 1038. Ingolstadt, 1601.)

Speaking of the language of the Eastern Liturgies invoking the Holy Spirit that "He sanctify and make this bread the holy body of thy Christ," etc., Dean Goode remarks, "Terms indicative of some sort of Change were freely used by the Fathers of that period. But the question recurs, What was their *meaning* in the use of these words? What *sort of change* was contemplated by them? And first I must observe, that *no language* could be more thoroughly opposed to the doctrine of Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison than that of these Liturgies. For it clearly contemplates, as *the effect* of the descent of the Holy Spirit, a change of some kind or other passing upon the bread and wine. Now, according to Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison, *the great effect* of the consecration is the *junction* of our Lord's body and blood *with* the bread and wine. And it is manifest, that if their doctrine had been the doctrine of the Church at the time that these Liturgies were put forth, the prayer would have been, that the Holy Spirit would cause the body and blood of Christ to be *united* to the bread and wine, and not that the bread and wine should be made or changed into that body and blood. And Dr. Pusey, when speaking of the language of the Liturgies, admits, that 'the Fathers not only say, that the bread *becomes* the body of Christ, but that it *is* the body of Christ.' And he justly reminds the Romanists, that 'this is inconsistent with conversion, as they believe it, or transubstantiation.' But what is *his own* explanation? I give it in his own words, 'The proposition, *This bread is my body*, could have no other meaning than that it was in some way, BOTH. *This, which is in its natural substance, bread, is sacramentally my body*,

¹ Bellarmine's words are, "Etsi Apostoli initio solam orationem Dominicam addidisse dicantur, tamen postea iidem ordinarunt ritum celebrandi, et multa alia addiderunt."

Cassander speaking of subsequent additions in the Roman Service says (quoting from Rupertus), "Non quidem sanctius hinc est, quam erat prius, quando ad sola verba Domini, solamque Dominicam orationem consecrabatur." (Works, p. 37. Edit. Paris, 1616. See also p. 38, where further testimony is adduced as to the original simplicity of the Service.)

Durandus writes, "Missam instituit Dominus Jesus . . . dicens *Hoc est corpus meum* . . . subjungens: *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*. Apostoli autem hanc Missam adauxerunt, dicentes in Missa non solum verba præmissa, verum etiam Dominicam orationem superaddentes. Unde beatus Petrus sic Missam primus dictur celebrasse in partibus orientalibus." (Durandus, Rationale Div. Office: Lib. iv., cap. i., p. 140. Naples, 1859. See, however, on the other side, Zacharia, "Bibliotheca Ritualis," vol. i., Dissertatio i., p. xvi. Rome, 1776.)

"Sequitur oblatio panis et calicis vino et aqua misti, *quam ut SIMPLICISSIMAM initio fuisse* verisimile omnino est, ita decenter et cum reverentia factam fuisse, non est dubitandum." (Renaudot: Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio. Tom. i., Dissertatio, p. vii. Frankfort-on-Maine, 1847. See also Bullinger, "De Origine Erroris." Fo. 204, a Zurich, 1539.)

through the presence of my body under its form.' But is this one whit more reasonable than the Roman Catholic interpretation? Let us try it in another case,—The proposition 'This picture is the Duke of Wellington,' could have no other meaning than that it was in some way, *both*. 'This, which is in its natural substance a picture, is in another way the Duke of Wellington, *through the presence of the Duke of Wellington under its form.*' Is this sound reasoning? . . . Dr. Pusey has assumed the very thing he had to prove, when he identifies a *sacramental* presence with the presence of the real body under the form of the bread. . . . Bellarmine candidly admits, that it is only *figuratively* that bread can *be* the body of Christ. . . . The question remains, What is the change here referred to? . . . There are three modes of answering this question. The *first* is that of the Romanists. . . . The *second* is that advocated by, among others, Johnson. . . . The *third* is, that the bread and wine are changed in *character, use, and effect*, so as to be effectual in the case of all faithful communicants, through the Divine blessing, for making their recipients partakers of the body and blood of Christ, by bringing them into communion with them, and thus become *sacramentally* and in *effect* the body and blood of Christ." (On Eucharist, i., pp. 443-445.) This is clearly the sense in which the words of the consecration Prayer of Edward's *first* Book were understood by Cranmer, and in which he took care to have them "*explained*" in the *Second* Book. See note above, p. 344.

Note BB, p. 301.

"It is well known that both Bishop Cosin and his friend Mr. (afterwards Archbishop) Sancroft used their best endeavours, at the time of the last revision in 1662, to conform the Communion Service more closely to that of 1549, and especially to restore the Prayer of Oblation to its ancient place immediately after the consecration, as 'more consonant both to former precedents and the nature of the holy action.'" (Medd's Introduction to Walton's "First Book of Edward VI.," p. xxi. See Blakeney on Common Prayer, pp. 143, 421, 433; Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 389-392, 376-378; and especially 391, 392, with note.)

Appended to the additional notes in Nicholls's Book of Common Prayer, is a paper of notes made by Bishop Cosin previous to or at the time of the last Review, of matters which he considered desirable to be altered in the Prayer Book, and of which Dr. Nicholls remarks, that "*most things*" were altered accordingly.

It may indeed be observed that these suggestions of Bishop Cosin do appear to have been ALMOST ALL embodied in the changes of 1662. But what is MOST *observable*, is that the striking exceptions are just those matters which might have seemed to tend to afford a handle for undoing the CLEARING work of our Reformers on the first Book of Edward. While of other alterations it may be said that AS A WHOLE they have been ACCEPTED: of these (though they are but very few) it must be said that AS A WHOLE they have been REJECTED.

This is so clear and striking, that, if we knew nothing else of the history of the last Review, it would seem sufficiently to attest the fact, that (notwithstanding the power of other influences at work) that Review was governed by a deliberate determination to make no room for the bringing in again of those Eucharistic doctrines which the Reformation had cleared away.

There was no disposition to reject the Bishop's recommendations. But there was a sense of apprehension, or a vigilance against danger, such as the Bishop apparently did not share; and with this evidently a resolution to allow no changes which would seem to make the voice of the Church of England less distinct in its condemnation of the Corporal Presence, and the sacrifice of the Mass.

So with the copy of the Edition of 1634, containing MSS. corrections in the handwriting of Sancroft—the corrections *as a whole* were "approved by the Convocation, and incorporated in the future Liturgy." But there were exceptions, and these exceptions are just those "which would seem to belong to the Laudian school of theology."

These, *as a whole*,¹ were rejected. (See Cardwell's *Conferences*, pp. 389-392.)

See also Blakeney's "Common Prayer," pp. 143-147, and J. H. Blunt's "Common Prayer," p. 186, note 1, and *Historical Introduction*, p. xli.

"Cosin proposed a re-arrangement and modification of the Prayers of Address, of the Consecration, Oblation, and the Lord's Prayer, in the Communion Office; at the bottom of the page in the Durham book is written in Sancroft's hand [who probably acted as Secretary to the committee of Bishops] My lords the bishops at Ely House [where the Committee held their meetings] *ordered ALL in the OLD method, thus, etc.*" (Editor's Preface to vol. v. of Cosin's Works, Anglo-Catholic Library, p. xxii. See note in the same vol., p. 518. See also Bulley's *Variations*, p. 142, note, and pp. 190, 191, 200.)

It is not unimportant to observe that the last Revision was *not* the work of the Savoy Commission, but of the Convocation and Parliament.² Dr. Blakeney says, "Notwithstanding the utter failure of the Savoy Commission, some authors have fallen into the mistake that our Prayer Book was revised at the Savoy" (p. 145, note). "The Parliament evinced a determination rather to fall back upon the book of 1604, or even the 2nd of Edward, than accept that of Laud, compiled in 1634" (p. 143). "The great body of the clergy surviving the Commonwealth had no sympathy with Laudianism. This, in some degree, may account for the fact that, while the proposals of Sancroft were rejected, many of the Puritan suggestions to which the

¹ This does not mean without exception. But the few exceptions will be allowed, I think, to be comparatively immaterial, and free from any special doctrinal significance.

² Not that the House of Commons took any action on the matter of the changes introduced beyond asserting their power to reconsider them. An account of their proceedings will be found in Cardwell's *Conferences*, pp. 374-378. See also p. 373.

Episcopal Commissioners would not listen, were carried into effect" (p. 145). See Cardwell's *Conferences*, chap. viii., and Preface to Nicholls's *Common Prayer*, p. x., and Burnet's *History* of his own time, pp. 124-5. Edit. Bohn.

Something like a similar attempt (it appears) had been made in the reign of Elizabeth and with the same result. At least Edward's Second Book was not restored (as a whole) without serious opposition. (See Nicholls's Preface to *Common Prayer*, p. vi.)

"Though Cecil, and some other of the courtiers, were for having King Edward's First Book established, or at least, to have some Particulars in it again received, as Prayers for the Dead, the Petition for the descent of the Holy Ghost on the Elements, in the Prayer for the Consecration of the Eucharist, and the delivering of the Bread into the mouth of the Communicant: yet the most learned of our Divines were against both these Proposals, and pitched on the second Liturgy to be established, with some few Alterations and Corrections." (Downes's Appendix appended to Sparrow's *Rationale*, 1722, p. 180.)

With respect to Cecil, Downes's Statement may be considered perhaps, to go somewhat too far. (See Collier's *Eccl. History*, vol. vi., p. 249, and Cardwell's *Conferences*, p. 21.) Evidence of the opposition may be seen in Strype's *Annals*, vol. i., chap. 4, pp. 82, 83.

Dr. Blakeney says, "There was a disposition on the part of the Queen to adopt the first rather than the second book, and this accounts at once both for the Primer of 1559, and the Orarium of 1560. The Bishops overruled the Royal tendencies in reference to images and altars, and we see the triumph of their principles in the fact that the later books of devotion of Elizabeth were completely Protestant." (On *Common Prayer*, p. 187.)

Note CC, p. 302.

It must not, however, be forgotten that the changes (such as they are) which have been made, have been, by no means, all in one direction. Some have been made in concession to the views of the Puritans, and these, perhaps (in the view of some) not the least important. It may be said of the changes made in the Prayer Book in Elizabeth's reign, that they were of a reactionary character (in the sense given in the text): not that they did, in any wise, alter the doctrine of our Church, but that their tendency was to make some points of decided Protestant doctrine less marked and prominent than before.

On the other hand, the changes made after the Hampton Court Conference (such as they were) are to be regarded as concessions to the Puritan party.

At the last review, it must be allowed that the influence of reactionary tendencies was kept in check, and, in the more important matters, completely defeated.

Canon Robertson writes: "A comparison with Sparrow's '*Ration-*

ale,' will show that Cosin's authority in the revision was controlled in many points by that of Sparrow, who seems, from coincidences, not only of opinion but of language, to have also had much influence on the answer of the Episcopal party to the objections of the Non-conformists at the Savoy Conference." ("How shall we Conform?" p. 26, note, Edit. 1869.)

As the result of the Review, we may be said to have a certain number of changes of no great importance or doctrinal significance, to a very few of which may be attributed somewhat of a reactionary character. But against these must be set the reintroduction of the Black Rubric, which was the undoing of the chief work of the reactionary influence in Elizabeth's reign, as well as other less important concessions to the desires of the Puritans.

Walton (whose view, however, may be regarded as not altogether unprejudiced) says, in his *Life of Bp. Sanderson* (p. 42 in Sanderson's *Sermons*, Edit. 1686), "Though this debate at the Savoy was ended without any great satisfaction to either party, yet both parties knew the desires, and understood the abilities of the other much better than before it; and the late distressed clergy, that were now restored to their former rights and power, were so charitable, as at their next meeting in Convocation to contrive to give the dissenting party satisfaction by alteration, explanation, and addition to some part, both of the *Rubrick and Common Prayer*, as also by adding some new necessary Collects, with a particular Collect of Thanksgiving.

Dr. Blakeney has pointed out that several of the changes "generally supposed to be of a retrogressive character," cannot fairly be set down in that class, and were some of them even made at the recommendation or suggestion of the Puritans. (See Blakeney on *Common Prayer*, pp. 153-156.)

Note DD, p. 302.

"There seems to have been no objection to this invocation (so customary¹ in the ancient liturgies) on any doctrinal ground, except

¹ "Invocatur autem [Spiritus Sanctus] super omnia quæ ad sacrum usum destinantur, quâ invocatione significatur consecratio rei ipsi inhærens, etiam absque usu sacro, materiæque dignitatem tribuens. Ita in orationibus quarum particulas retulimus ad vasa sacra benedicenda, invocatur Deus, ut ea consecret, eo fine ut in illis conficiantur Sacramenta. Inde vero eadem vasa sancta habentur, nec profanis manibus absque crimine tractari possunt. Invocatur quoque ut mittat Spiritum sanctum super aquas baptismales, ut in illis baptisati accipiant regenerationem, omniumque peccatorum remissionem: super oleum et chrisma, ut gratiam baptisatis novam conferant: super ordinandos, ut accipiant sanctimoniam, et potestatem ad sacra ministeria sancte exercenda: super oleum infirmorum, ut ejus unctio prosit infirmis, ad salutem animæ et corporis." (Renaudot, *Liturg: Orient: Tom. i.*, p. 179. Edit. Frankfort, 1847.)

See Waterland's *Works*, vol. iv., p. 692, sqq.; who says "All circumstances show, that the true and ancient intent of that part of the service was not to implore any physical change in the Elements, no, nor so much as a physical connexion of the Spirit with the Elements, but a moral change only in the Elements, as to rela-

for its connexion with the clause in the latter part of the sentence, implying the real presence in the consecrated elements—‘That they may be unto us,’ etc.—and that connexion not only caused its omission in 1552, but probably also prevented its restoration at the last review.” (Principles at Stake, p. 273.)

“I may take notice . . . of the wisdom of our first Reformers, who, while they thought of inserting any prayer at all for the *illapse* of the *Spirit*, resolved to do it equally and indifferently in *both* the *Offices*, as well in the office of Baptism as in the office of the Communion; for there is, undoubtedly, as much reason and as great authority for it with respect to the former, as there is with respect to the latter. Indeed, they were both thrown out afterwards, upon *prudential* considerations, and at the instance, chiefly, of two learned and judicious foreigners, whom Archbishop Cranmer called in to assist at the review of our Liturgy in 1551.” (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 695.)

“The prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit is by no means express in either of the ancient English uses, or in the Roman.” (Maskell’s Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, Pref. p. 1.)

“There is no trace of any prayer for the Holy Ghost to bless and consecrate the elements in the ancient liturgies of Milan, Italy, and Rome.” (Palmer’s Origines Liturgicæ, vol. ii., p. 137.)

“Oral tradition being admitted to be the only means of conveyance used for three centuries, the forms that prevailed in the Church at the period when the Liturgy was first committed to writing, cannot be held to be sufficient proofs of the nature of the service as it existed three centuries before. More particularly is this the case with respect to any part which is not *common* to ALL the most ancient liturgies we have remaining. And in the very part which is chiefly referred to . . . there is a *discrepancy* between them. For no invocation of the Holy Spirit occurs in the most ancient forms of the Roman Liturgy.”¹ (“Goode on Eucharist,” i., pp. 439, 440. See also Courayer on English Orders. Oxford Edit., p. 175.)

tions and uses, and a gracious presence of the Holy Spirit upon the *communicants*.” (Page 692.)

¹“For the three first centuries, and part of the fourth, nothing at all was said, as far as appears, of any descent of the *third Person* upon the Elements.” (Waterland’s Works, vol. v., p. 189. See also vol. iv., pp. 695, 696.)

Renaudot says—“Observandum denique Syros in eâ [Invocationis formâ] *veterem simplicitatem* magis retinuisse quam Græcos, qui formulas aliquot interponunt, ut in Liturgiâ Basilii Sacerdos secreto dicit: *Domine qui Spiritum sanctum hora tertia Apostolis misisti, illum, o bone, ne auferas a me. Cor mundum crea in me, Deus, et Spiritum rectorum invoca in visceribus meis.* Tum Diaconus caput inclinans, designat orario sanctum panem et dicit secreto: *Benedic, Domine, sanctum panem.*” (Renaudot, Liturg: Orient: Tom. ii., p. 94. Edit. Frankfort, 1847.)

“I cannot think this Prayer [of Invocation] necessary, which is nowhere mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, and has no manner of foundation in the word of God. . . . I do not believe, but that some of the Ante-Nicene Fathers would have expressly mentioned it, if it had been the Established Doctrine of the Church in those Ages, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord’s Supper were made the body and blood of Christ, by the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon them.” (*The Doctrine of the Eucharist stated: and the Harmony between the Primitive Church and the Re-*

"Although . . . some few have contended that the Apostles left behind them written liturgies, yet so great is the majority against them, that we may say it is agreed upon that they did not. . . . It appears also to be not less agreed upon that for many years after, perhaps for the first two centuries, liturgies were not committed to writing. Renaudot is clearly of this opinion : he says that it is beyond all controversy, and cites S. Basil, *de Spiritu Sancto*, to prove that before his time no liturgy was written." (Maskell's *Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England*, Pref. pp. xxiv., xxv. See Courayer on *English Orders*. Oxford Edit., p. 173. See above, pp. 543, 544. Note.)

Note EE, p. 305.

Let the reader be asked to compare this statement with the following directions contained in a Ritualistic "Manual of Devotions."

"*Rubric.* Now kneel upright with your hands clasped upon your heart; follow the Priest in silent awe; for Jesus thy God is very nigh thee. He is *about to DESCEND upon the ALTAR* surrounded by the fire of the Holy Ghost and attended by His angels.

"At the consecration and ELEVATION. Prostrate yourself in the dust and say,—Hail! Body of my God. Hail! Body of my Redeemer, I ADORE, I ADORE, I ADORE Thee."

The "Little Prayer Book" recommends this prayer—"BREAD *made Flesh* by the Omnipotence of the Word, have mercy upon us!" (See *Principles at Stake*, pp. 166-168.)

Compare also the following from "The People's Hymnal" (No. 179).

"Jesu, my Lord, my God, my all!
How can I love Thee as I ought?
And how revere this wondrous Gift,
So far surpassing hope or thought?
Sweet SACRAMENT, we THEE adore!
O make us *love THEE* more and more!

* * * *

"O see! within a *creature's* HAND
The VAST CREATOR deigns to be,
Reposing, infant-like, as though
On Joseph's arm, or Mary's knee.
Sweet SACRAMENT, we THEE adore!
O make us *love THEE* more and more!

* * * *

"Sound, sound His praises higher still,
And come, ye angels, to our aid;
'TIS GOD! 'TIS GOD! THE VERY GOD!
Whose power both men and angels made.
Sweet SACRAMENT, we THEE adore!
O make us *love THEE* more and more!"

formed Church of England manifested, by which the Conduct of our Essentialists is censured; by a Presbyterian of the Church of England, p. 43. London, 1720, p. 43.)

Dr. Heurtley well observes (Remarks on Declaration, p. 12), "When the influence of poetry and music combined is considered, it is not difficult to foresee, that if this Hymnal should be brought into general use, and become in reality, what its title vaunts it to be, 'The People's Hymnal,' the work of our Reformers will be virtually undone. It signifies LITTLE to restrain RITUAL observances, if the evil leaven, which those observances are believed to cover, is permitted to be introduced more effectually in another way."

Bishop Morton writes:—"You press the point of the *Invocation of the Sacrament* more urgently and vehemently than any other: and we indeed believe that the ancient Fathers (if they had held, according to the now Roman Church, a *corporal presence of Christ*) would never have celebrated any Mass, without an express *Invocation* of the Sacrament, as in your now-Roman mass we find it done. . . . Yet know (now) that your own learned *Pamelius* hath published two large Tomes of all the *Masses in the Latin Church*, from Pope *Clemens* down to Pope *Gregory* (containing the compass of six hundred years), we say, Latin Missals above forty in number; in all which, upon our once reading, we presume to say that there is not one such tenour of *Invocation* at all." (Morton on Eucharist, Book vii., chap. 4, sect. 1, p. 525. Edit. 1635.)

And so Bishop Bilson:—"That these and all other parts of divine honour are due to Christ, no Christian may doubt; but that the same may be applied to the host, this is your blasphemy, *no father ever taught it*. . . . He [Christ] is more truly, really and naturally in those men that be His members than He is in the elements that be used at His table. . . . Men are the members of Christ, bread is not; Christ abideth in them, and they in Him, in the bread He doeth not: He will raise them in the last day, the bread He will not; they shall reign with Him for ever, the bread shall not. . . . I send you to Chrysostom, Cyril and Hilary, who will teach you . . . that Christ is *in us* really, naturally, corporally, carnally, substantially, which of the Sacrament you shall never be able to prove. For the Sacrament is no part of His mystical body, as we are, and therefore we are knit unto Him even by the truth of His and our nature, flesh, and substance, as members of the same body to their head; the Sacrament is not, but only annexed as a sign to the heavenly grace and virtue of Christ mightily present, and truly entering the soul of every man that is fitly prepared with faith and repentance to receive and lodge so worthy a guest." (Bishop Bilson's True Differences, etc. Edit. 1585, pp. 719, 720.)

Archbishop Bramhall says—"We deny not a venerable respect unto the consecrated Elements, not only as love-tokens sent us by our best Friend, but as the instruments ordained by our Saviour to convey to us the merits of His Passion; but [and ?] for the Person of Christ, God forbid that we should deny Him Divine worship at any time, and especially in the use of this Holy Sacrament; we believe with St. Austin, that 'no man eats of that Flesh, but first he adores:'—but that which offends us is this, that you teach and require all

men to adore the very Sacrament with Divine honour. To this end you hold it out to the people. To this end *Corpus Christi* day was instituted about 300 years since. Yet we know that even upon your own grounds you cannot without a particular revelation, have an infallible assurance that any Host is consecrated; and consequently you have no assurance that you do not commit material idolatry. But that which weighs most with us is this, that we dare not give Divine worship to any creature, no, not to 'the very humanity of Christ in the abstract (much less to the Host), but to the *whole* Person of Christ, God and Man, by reason of the hypostatical union between the child of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the Eternal Son, 'Who is God over all Blessed for ever.' *Shew us such an union betwixt the Deity and the Elements, or accidents, and you say something.* But you pretend no such things. The highest that you dare go is this: 'as they that adored Christ when He was upon earth, did after a kind of manner adore His garments.' Is this all? That is 'after a kind of manner' indeed. We have enough. There is no more adoration due to the Sacrament, than to the garments which Christ did wear upon earth. Exact no more." (Bramhall's Works, Oxford Edit., vol. i., pp. 20, 21.)

"The Grecians know no feast of *Corpus Christi*, nor carry the Sacrament up and down, nor elevate it to be adored." (Ibid. vol. ii., p. 634.)

See also Crakanthorp, "Defensio Eccles: Anglic." Edit. Oxford, pp. 538, 539; and Morton's Catholic Appeal, p. 120; and Dr. Andrew Willet's Synopsis Papismi, vol. v., pp. 311-315. Edit. 1852.

"St. Austin says 'No man eats the flesh of Christ, but he that first worships it.' And there are like expressions in Ambrose, Chrysostom, and some other ancient writers. But then they sufficiently explain their own meaning, giving us to understand, that they neither speak of oral manducation, nor of adoring Christ as corporeally present in the Eucharist, but as spiritually present, or else as corporeally absent in heaven. St. Chrysostom says, 'They fell down before Christ their King as captives in baptism, and that they cast themselves down upon their knees before Him.' And yet no one would conclude, therefore, that they worshipped Him as corporeally present in baptism, although baptism made them partakers of His body and blood also. He says further, 'That the King himself bowed his body, because of God speaking in the holy Gospels.' But it would be ridiculous hence to infer, either that they worshipped the gospels, or Christ as corporeally present in them." (Bingham, book xv., chap. v., § 5, vol. v., p. 254.)

"Here, saith honest Minucius, *Pagans melt brass, they cast it, they set it up, they fasten it; 'tis yet no God: they polish it, they adorn it: neither is it yet a God. But see now, they consecrate it, and pray to it, then as soon as men will have it to be a God, it is a God.* Was this wise man blind, not to see that Pagans might return the same raillery? Christians sow wheat, they cut, gather, and thresh it, 'tis no Christ yet: they grind it, they sift it, they bake it; 'tis but a

wafer; they set it upon an Altar, they elevate it, and cross it several times; no wonder yet: at last they speak five words upon it, presently ten Miracles break forth, and among an hundred wafers, which are all like one to another, that which they are pleased to think upon, is their *Saviour*. Where was the wit and judgment of holy Fathers, St. Chrysostom, Arnobius, Tertullian (if they had then Rome's Mass worship) when they charged Pagans with flat madness, for lodging their Gods in Images, or for dreaming of consecrations, which might turn the fate of vile materials into gods, or shut these venerable Gods in vile vessels; not perceiving in the mean while, that if Christians did then what Roman Catholics do now, both ancient Christians and new Catholics fall visibly to worse follies?" (Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass, by Dan. Brevint, D.D., 1673, pp. 95, 96. See Bishop Morton on Eucharist, book vii., chap. 8, especially p. 548. Edit. 1635.)

Archbishop Sharp makes the same quotation from Minucius Felix, and says, "If the practice of the pagans in this matter was absurd and ridiculous, then every jot as much was the practice of the Christians, and might have been as easily made appear so, and would without doubt have been made so, had there been any such practice among them." (Works, Edit. Oxford, 1829, vol. v., p. 253.)

"Let the upholders of it [the worship due to a Personal Presence on the Altar] produce a *single instance* from the ancient Communion Offices¹ of a prayer, or even an invocation, so addressed. It cannot be done. Or if there be found such an one lurking in some remote corner of a Liturgy, its manifest departure from the whole tone and bearing of the rest of the Office stamps it at once as late and unauthoritative." (Archdeacon Freeman's Rites and Ritual, pp. 36, 37.)

"The ancient Liturgies throughout speak of that which is consecrated, and lies upon the Altar, as *Things*, and *not as a person*. But if it be Christ Himself that lies there, is it reverent to speak of Him as 'Things,' 'Offerings,' or even as 'Mysteries'?" (Ibid. p. 37. See Morton on Eucharist, book viii., chap. i.)

"Let these words of S. Chrysostom's Liturgy be especially pondered: 'Hear us, O Lord Jesus Christ, out of Thy Holy Dwelling-place, and from the *Throne of the glory of Thy Kingdom*; Thou that sittest above with the Father, and here art invisibly present with us: and by Thy mighty Hand *give us to partake* of Thy spotless body and Thy precious blood.' Is it not perfectly certain from hence, that, in the conception of antiquity, Our Blessed Lord *was* not lying personally upon the altar? that, personally, He was, as regards His Majestic Presence, on His Throne in heaven? And as regards His Mysterious Presence on earth, it was to be sought, *not in or under*

¹Speaking of the Ancient Liturgies L'Aroque says, "It must be confessed that it is a wonderful thing if this religious Adoration had been in use, that neither one nor another should say anything of it, the action being of moment sufficient not to be forgotten in such ample and exact descriptions, as those be which are contained in these Liturgies." (L'Aroque, "History of the Eucharist." Walker's Translation, 1684, p. 566.)

the Elements, but (according to the proper law of it) in and among the faithful, the Church of God there present?"¹ (Ibid. p. 38. See Bishop Morton on Eucharist, book vii., chap. 4, sect. 2, pp. 525-527. Edit. 1635.)

"Mr. Keble tells us that Eucharistical Adoration assumes the Real, by which he means the Objective Presence. When he enters upon the historical evidence for the practice, he begins with the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem, going therefore no higher than the middle of the fourth century. And as to the Liturgies, though he endeavours to meet the objection supplied by his own acknowledgment, he candidly admits the 'omission of the subject (of Eucharistical Adoration) in the Primitive Liturgies,' which, he says, 'are almost or altogether silent as to any worship of Christ's body and blood after consecration. We find in them neither any form of prayer addressed in special to the Holy Humanity so present, nor any Rubric enjoining adoration inward or outward.'

"If, however, the doctrine of Eucharistical Adoration rests upon the assumption of the Objective Presence, as Mr. Keble himself says it does, the objection drawn from this silence, so far as it militates against the one, must be equally valid against the other." (Bishop of Llandaff's Charge, 1869, p. 122.)

Note FF, p. 306.

In the articles of 1553, the 28th Article contained the following : "Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth, that the body of one and the self same man cannot be at one time in divers places, but must needs be in some one certain place. Therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places. And because (as holy Scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not, either to believe or openly to confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood, in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." It is impossible not to observe the similarity between this and the Black Rubric. Both condemned *in words* "The Real Presence." And both were removed in the reign of Elizabeth. But while thus we may be glad that all condemnation of the words "Real Presence" was removed; we may be thankful also that the *doctrine* intended by the words "Real Presence" in the previous article, was excluded by the introduction of another article (the 29th) which applied a severer test of doctrine, than any condemnation of the words "Real Presence" which were of doubtful signification. Burnet says of the words substituted in the 28th Article, "This seemed to be MORE THEOLOGICAL and it does indeed amount to

¹ "Deus nusquam præcepit panis consecrati adorationem. Est ergo ἐθελο-
θηρησκηλα. Pulchre Chrysostomus homil. 51, in Matth.: *Discamus, Christum ex
ipsius voluntate honorare, Nam qui honoratur, eo maxime honore lætatur, quem
ipse vult, non quem nos optamus.*" (Gerhard's *Confessio Catholica*, ii., p. 998.
Jena, 1661.)

THE SAME THING." (See Burnet on 39 Articles, p. 409. Edit. Oxford, 1831.)

Bishop Forbes (on Articles, vol. ii., p. 580) makes an argument from Queen Elizabeth's own faith with regard to the Sacrament, and quotes from Heylin, that "when one of her divines had preached a sermon in defence of the REAL PRESENCE on the day commonly called Good Friday, in 1565, she openly gave him thanks for his pains and piety." (See Rev. L. Rivington's "Inward part or thing signified," p. 15.) The same argument has been used before by one who urged that "Dr. Heylin and others have observed of this Queen, that she was a *zealous propugner* of the REAL PRESENCE." To which this reply was given by Archbishop Wake, "Which may be *very true*, and yet but *LITTLE TO THE PURPOSE*, if she propugned it in the same sense that her brother King Edward the VIth and the Church of England *had done before*, and not in the *NEW NOTION* imposed upon her by this author, but *WITHOUT ANY MANNER OF PROOF* to warrant his suggestion." (Archbishop Wake in Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. x., p. 64.)

We may gather somewhat of the wide difference between the "Real Presence" of Queen Elizabeth and the "Real Objective Presence" of our day, from what the same historian (Heylin) tells us of her command, before she adopted any decided measures of Reformation: "She had commanded the Priest or Bishop (for some say it was the one, and some the other), who officiated at the altar in the Chapel-Royal, not to make any elevation of the Sacrament, the better to prevent that adoration which was given unto it, and which she *could not suffer* to be done in her sight without a most *apparent wrong to her judgment and conscience*." (History of Reformation. E. H. S. Edit., vol. ii., p. 272.) Lingard tells us that when Oglethorpe, Bishop of Carlisle, declined to obey this order, saying that "his life was the Queen's, but his conscience was his own," the Queen "rising immediately after the Gospel, retired with her attendants." (See Lingard's History of England. Edit. 1855, Dolman, vol. vi., pp. 4, 5; and note in Heylin as above; also notes in Heylin, vol. ii., pp. 316, 317.)

Indeed directions had been issued, forbidding the Elevation of the host, before the proclamation of Dec. 27, 1558, against innovations without authority. And Hallam supposes that the refusal of the bishops to officiate at her coronation (Jan. 14, 1558-9) arose from the Queen's order that the host should not be elevated. (See Hallam's Constitutional History, vol. i., p. 110. Edit. 1867.)

Parsons says that Elizabeth accounted Zwingle and his followers as *saints* (Responsio ad Edictum Reg: Angl., p. 165. Rome, 1593) and that the English regarded the doctrine of Zwingle, Œcolampadius and Calvin as the truth of the Gospel. (Ibid. p. 292, "*quam Angli pro veritate Evangelica tuentur*.") And he sets down the Lutheran condemnation of the Reformed (the *Secta Zuingliana*) as the "*Lutheranorum judicium de religione Anglicana*," (p. 292, margin).

And Sanders also, though he seems rather to aim at fastening something of a Lutheran *odium* on Elizabeth's proceedings, (see

pp. 293, 294, 302, 303) writes thus:—"Tremendum missæ sacrificium, cum reliquo omni sanctissimo ritu precandi, et sacramenta administrandi abolet; et nova sacra, ceremonias, precesque in lingua vulgari ad normam maxime Lutheranorum (hoc solo excepto, quod imagines sacras sustulerit) præscribit, licet *fides Calvin*i magis tum, et deinceps ab istis legislatoribus eorumque ministris et sectatoribus sit approbata." (Sanders, "De Schismate Angl.," p. 279. Ingolstadt, 1587.)

Moreover Neal, while desiring to represent Elizabeth as almost a Papist in respect of her fondness for ceremonial observances, acknowledges that the *doctrine* she approved was that of the Reformed Churches. (See "History of Puritans," vol. i., p. 383.)

It will assist the reader, perhaps, to form a judgment, as to whether Elizabeth *was* on the Lutheran side of the sacramental controversy, and as to whether the Church of England in her reign stood in any doubtful position in this matter, to read the following extracts from the Speech (as given in Hospinian) which Elizabeth's ambassador made, under her instructions, with reference to the *Formula concordiæ*—"Consultum duxit [Serenissima Angliæ Regina] Me ad Celsitudines vestras mittere . . . ut intercederem . . . ne talis aliqua Censura et Conventus fiant, per quos non tantum paucis in Germania Ecclesiis, sed omnibus quæ sunt in Regno Galliæ, Angliæ, Hiberniæ, Scotiæ, Poloniæ, Hungariæ, Helvetiæ, et aliis multis locis præjudicium fiat, quæ a dicta formula diversum sentiunt." (Concordia Discors, in Works, vol. v., p. 147. Geneva, 1678. See also pp. 148, b, and 149, a.)

Still more important it is to observe the prominent position taken by the English Ambassadors in the assembly of the Reformed held at Frankfort-on-Maine (1577) for the purpose of thwarting the designs of the Lutheran party. (See Hospinian, Concordia Discors, in Works, vol. v., pp. 143-145.)

The reader may be asked specially to observe the petition to Elizabeth, as to the nursing-mother of the Churches, and holding the highest place among the Reformed Princes, to send a Theologian to assist in drawing up a common confession of faith for all the Reformed Churches. Hospinian says, "Omnibus placuit I. Ut Illustrissimus Princeps Dux Casimirus totius Conventus nomine humiliter rogetur, ne gravetur Serenissimæ Reginæ Angliæ, velut primariæ Ecclesiarum Nutrici atque faultrici, et quæ primum inter Principes, puriore religionem profitentes, locum obtinet, scribere, et ab ejus Majestate petere, ut ad hujus Confessionis conscriptionem, Theologum unum in Germaniam mittere dignetur, qui una cum aliis, huic tam necessario operi incumbat." (Works, vol. v., p. 145, a. Geneva, 1678.)

There is evidence also of Elizabeth's high esteem for John A Lasco (see Gorham's Reformation gleanings, p. 402); and of her desire to have P. Martyr in England, *after* reading his treatise on the Eucharist. (Ibid. pp. 392, 382.)

Perhaps the following extract from Strype's Life of Aylmer may not be out of place here as tending yet further to show what sort of

reception the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist met with in England in Elizabeth's reign. Strype has been describing the alarm occasioned by the publication of "The discovery of a gaping gulph, whereinto England is like to be swallowed up by another French Marriage, if the Lord forbid not the Banns." Then he says, "It was therefore thought convenient to send a hasty Dispatch to London to the Bishop there, to summon the Clergy for the better pacifying these matters. And on a sudden, September 27, 1579, on Sunday at one of the Clock, the Clergy of the City were called unto the Bishop's Palace, where forty of them appeared: Then the Bishop, the Dean of Paul's being present and assistant, told them the Occasion of his sudden calling for them was, to admonish them of two things Chiefly. The former was of one *Andreas Jacobus*, a *Dutch-man*, and as it seems a Minister of the Strangers Church in London: who was a *Lutheran*, or an *Ubiquitary*, as they now stiled them, who were for the Real Presence: and had caused great quarrels among the Strangers Preachers. He warned them to take heed, how they gave ear to the Sophistical Arguments of him, or any such like." (Strype's Aylmer, pp. 62, 63. London, 1701.)

Note GG, p. 306.

Not that they had any objection to it. They say—"This rubric is not in the Liturgy of Queen Elizabeth, nor confirmed by law; nor is there any great need of restoring it, the world being now in more danger of profanation than idolatry. Besides, the sense of it is declared sufficiently in the 28th Article of the Church of England." (Cardwell's Conferences, p. 354.) So L'Estrange, giving reasons for kneeling, says—"As the fear of reverting to Popish *idolatry* is *altogether vain*, so the danger of apostatizing from Christ is very great." (Alliance of Divine Offices, Edit. Oxford, p. 323.) And of the Rubric he says—"How, by whom, or upon what account, and inducement, this EXCELLENT RUBRIC, anciently called 'a protestation touching the gesture of kneeling,' came to be omitted in Queen Elizabeth's Liturgy, I cannot determine, and would gladly learn." (Ibid. p. 329.) Bishop Cosin says¹—"Because the body and blood is neither sensibly present (nor *otherwise* AT ALL PRESENT, but only to those who are duly prepared to receive them, and in the very act of receiving them and the consecrated elements together, to which they are sacramentally united), the adoration is then and there given to Christ Himself, *neither is nor ought to be directed to any external sensible object*, such as are the *blessed elements*." (In Nicholls's Additional Notes on Communion Service, p. 49.) Of *elevation* Bishop Cosin says—"Which rite neither we, nor any of the Reformed or Protestant Churches, observe, but (*in regard of the PERIL OF IDOLATRY*) have wholly omitted it." (Ibid. p. 47.) "Our kneeling," he says, "is ordained *only* to testify and express the inward reverence and devotion of our souls

¹ As to the views expressed in the earlier series of notes, now attributed to Bishop Cosin, see note above, Paper No. VI., p. 191, note.

toward our blessed Saviour." (Ibid. p. 49.) All that George Herbert says in "The Country Parson" (quoted by Mr. Keble, "On Eucharistical Adoration," p. 157; Edit. 1867) may 'surely be very well and naturally understood in this same sense.

In the Introduction "by way of Preface before Archbishop Laud's Various Readings," ch. viii., among the "Answers" of Mr. T. Hutton to Puritan exceptions, we read (p. 28)—"*Exception 7.* The people are commanded by the Rubrick to receive the sacrament kneeling . . . which is dangerous. For (1) They say kneeling is worshipping (Mark v. 22; Luke viii. 41; Matt. ix. 18).—*Answer.* Kneeling is NOT in those places put for *DIVINE Worship*; for bending the knee, how common it was in the Eastern country is well known, (Gen. xxxiii. 3 and xxiii. 7.) Children do it to their parents, and subjects to their king. [NOTE.—Overall was not the only one who fell on his knees before King James at the Hampton Court Conference.] (2) They say, this kneeling was brought into the sacrament by Antichrist; Pope Honor. III., anno 1220, teaching the people to worship the bread.—*Answer.* The question is NOT of *kneeling to the Sacrament*, but AT the Sacrament: the ONE we ALLOW, the OTHER we CONDEMN. Honor. III. first commanded the people, at ELEVATION TIME, to incline and bow themselves, and when the host was carried in PROCESSION." (See Appendix to Nicholls's Common Prayer, Edit. 1712.)²

¹ For Herbert's language (as Dean Goode observes, on Euch., ii., p. 883) "is highly figurative and symbolical, or it is blasphemous."

² "As to the Ceremony of *Kneeling at the Communion*. If our Church's Declaration at the end of the Communion Service, will not vindicate her from an unlawful symbolizing with Rome herein, I have nothing to say in her defence. The Declaration is this, *Whereas, etc., etc.* We see that our Church doth here, not only declare that no adoration is in this gesture intended, either to the Elements or to Christ's Corporal Presence under the species of Bread and Wine, but also that, as such a pretence is absurd and contradictory, so the adoring of the Sacramental Bread and Wine, would be Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. . . . So that . . . all the Idolatry and Superstition too, wherewith the Church of Rome hath abused it, is perfectly removed, and 'tis required by our Church merely as a decent Reverend Gesture." ("The Resolution of this Case of Conscience whether the Church of England's Symbolizing so far as it doth with the Church of Rome makes it unlawful to hold Communion with the Church of England?" London, 1683, pp. 48, 49.)

"Kneeling must be judged as fitting and convenient to be used at such a time, when we signify our desires and affections by external Rites and Ceremonies of God's appointment, as when we do it by words, that is, when we say our Prayers. . . . If we do but consider what invaluable Blessings we expect to receive by our worthy partaking of the Consecrated Bread and Wine at the Table of our Lord (such as forgiveness of all our sins, the plentiful communication of His Grace and Spirit, and a Right and Title to Eternal Life) we can't think Kneeling an unmeet and unbecoming Gesture in the act of receiving the Outward Signs and Pledges of this inward and invisible grace. . . . Why should not a submissive lowly deportment of Body suit with this solemnity as well as a humble lowly mind? And *this is that* which our Church declares to be the *end and design* of her injunction, in requiring the Communicants to kneel, viz. for a Signification of an humble and grateful acknowledgment of the Benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers." ("The case of Kneeling at the Holy Sacrament stated and resolved." London, 1683, pp. 52-55.)

So Archbishop Secker writes :—" It is true we kneel at the Sacrament as they [Romanists] do, but for a *very different purpose* : not to acknowledge 'any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood ;' as our Church, to *prevent all possibility of misconception*, EXPRESSLY DECLARES ; adding that 'His body is in heaven and not here ;' but to worship Him who is everywhere present, the invisible God. And this posture of kneeling we by no means look upon as in itself necessary, but as a very becoming appointment, and very fit to accompany the prayers and praises which we offer up at the instant of receiving ; and to express that inward spirit of piety and humility on which our partaking worthily of this ordinance, and receiving benefit from it, depend." (Lectures on the Catechism, vol. ii., pp. 252, 253 ; Edit. 1769.)

So also Kettlewell :—" When we are exercising repentance, and uttering praise, and making solemn prayers and oblations, it is not certainly improper to use such gestures as best become devotions." (Mr. John Kettlewell's Works, 1719, vol. i., p. 463.)

"No posture is necessary, but all, both theirs and ours, are still indifferent. . . . Thus then is our kneeling posture at the Holy Communion (as all others, *standing* or *sitting*, where that is the fashion) no *unlawful* thing." (Ibid. p. 467.)

"In kneeling at the Holy Sacrament, I say, there is no fear of worshipping the bread, because we do not kneel to it, nor have intention to worship it. If we should kneel down to the bread, indeed, and, submitting ourselves before it, pay divine honour and homage to it, this were really to worship the bread. And this the Papists plainly do. . . . But although this be *their* intention, yet it is in no case *ours* in kneeling at the Sacrament : for we kneel not to the bread, to give homage and adoration unto it, as our Church has most expressly declared in the Rubrick : so that if any persons intend any such thing, they must not say they follow the Church in that, since in the most earnest and express words it utterly disclaims and warns us all against it ; but we use kneeling to a quite different end—viz., only as it is a reverential, humble posture, wherein we may very decently¹ receive gifts, and make confession of our sins, and give thanks, and pour out our prayers to Almighty God ; so that our kneeling is only unto God. . . . This, I say, is *ALL we do* in kneeling at the Holy Sacrament, as the Church *requires*, and as our own consciences bear us witness." (Ibid. pp. 468, 469.)

"To worship the bread, as the Papists do, is to kneel down to it, and to pay divine honour and adoration to it, because they believe Christ bodily present therein ; and this may be done in any posture." (Ibid. pp. 469, 470.)

Bishop Burnet says—"Surely there is a great want of ingenuity in them that are pleased to apply these orders of some later Popes for

¹ Compare Hooker—"Coming as receivers of inestimable grace at the hands of God, what doth better beseem our bodies at that hour than to be sensible witnesses of minds unfeignedly humbled?" (Vol. ii., p. 366. Edit. Keble.)

kneeling at the elevation, to our kneeling; when ours is not at one such part, which might be more liable to exception, but during the whole office: by which it is one continued act of worship, and the communicants kneel all the while." (History of the Reformation, Edit. Orr, 1850, vol. i., p. 416.)

"N. In your receiving of the Communion we disallow your Idolatrous kneeling. [*Answer.*] When we pray, kneeling is a gesture most convenient. But in the receiving we do pray by the commandment of the Church. For both the minister prayeth, and we also are commanded to receive it with thanksgiving, which is a kind of prayer: and therefore kneeling cannot be denied to be expedient." (Ambrose Fisher's Defence of the Liturgy, 1630, p. 160.)

"Of kneeling in the act of receiving the Lord's Supper.—I confess that I never saw cause to think this unlawful to be done, and therefore I do it. First, because the Church of England abhorreth all adoration of the Sacrament, and the Papists know it. Secondly, because it holdeth *sitting* or *standing*, to be as lawful and holy as *kneeling*, putting no necessity or worship of God in any of these arbitrary gestures. Yea, because in this Church a prayer is then used for each communicant, this gesture may seem more agreeable to the external arbitrary form here used, than to the fashion of other Churches, whose liberty is not abridged by ours; as not ours, by theirs." (From Dr. Burgess's "Interpretations," of which he declares—"These interpretations King James accepted, and my Lord's Grace of Canterbury affirmed them to be the true sense and intention of the Church of England." See "An Answer Rejoyned; by Dr. John Burgess," 1631, pp. 25, 26; also p. 273. See also Paper No. VI., pp. 199, 200.)

So Bishop Hall:—"This is our gesture of reverence in our prayer at the receipt . . . not of idolatrous adoration of the bread." (Works, vol. ix., pp. 439, 440; Edit. Pratt, 1808.) Again:—"They [the Papists] direct their devotions, at the best, *by the crucifix, to their Saviour*; we do *not so* by the bread: we kneel no more to the bread than to the pulpit when we join our prayers with the minister's." (Ibid. p. 440. See also p. 487.)

"He must have the knee of a camel, and heart of oak, that will not bow himself, and after the manner of adoration and worship say Amen (as S. Cyril speaks) to so pathological a prayer and thanksgiving, made by the minister unto God in his behalf. And this is a powerful argument indeed for conformity in this point: with the which I have seen some Leicestershire people of good sort, that had been refractory for a long time, satisfied in an instant by the Bishop of the diocese, being very sorry they had not observed so much before,—that in the Church of England, our whole act of receiving is accompanied in every part with the act of praying and thanksgiving." ("The Holy Table—Name and Thing," pp. 135, 136; Edit. 1637.)

So Archbishop Whitgift had said in reply to Cartwright's objections—"You should have learned that the *whole action* of this Supper is a thanksgiving, and therefore it is called *Eucharistia*; so that

kneeling is a convenient gesture for it *during the whole time*¹ of the celebration." (Works, vol. iii., pp. 91, 92.)

When Cartwright spoke of avoiding "the danger of idolatry," (p. 93) Whitgift replied—"There is no such peril in kneeling at the Communion as you surmise; for the gospeller is better instructed than so grossly to err." (Page 95.)

And so before this Cranmer had written (1552)—"I pray you to consider that there be two prayers which go before the receiving of the Sacrament, and two immediately follow—all which time the people, praying and giving thanks, do kneel. And what inconvenience there is that it may not be thus ordered, I know not. If the kneeling of the people should be discontinued for the time of receiving of the Sacrament, so that at the receipt thereof they should rise up and stand or sit, and then immediately kneel down again—it should rather import a contemptuous than a reverent receiving of the Sacrament." (See J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, Introd., p. xxxii.; and Perry on "Declaration Concerning Kneeling," pp. 77, 78.)

Note HH, see p. 307.

Mr. Perry has written a volume of 442 pages 8vo, with the view of reconciling "The Declaration concerning Kneeling" with the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence."

I cannot say what effect this volume may have upon other minds. But I must say, that upon *one* mind (which, no doubt, will be regarded by Mr. Perry as very prejudiced) it has left the impression of the *weakness* of the position, which is here with so much ability maintained.

If any should desire to see evidence to show that the Declaration was *not* understood as directed *only* against any *such* a particular *conception* of the presence, it will suffice, I think, to ask attention to the following extract from the writings of an ardent admirer and an able defender of the well-known non-juror Dr. Hicke; a divine whose opinions were (not without some reason, I believe) accounted the *ne plus ultra* of a period which fostered and ripened some extreme *Ultra-Anglican* views.

"I have already declared against the Personal Presence, or Sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharistical elements. Nor do I suppose that the bread and wine *represent* His whole person, as He is God and Man; but only His *sacrificed body* and His *effused blood*. His soul was separated from the body before the sacrifice was consummated. We have in the Sacrament His body and blood consecrated and ad-

¹ So Bishop Cosin—"The communicants kneel during the reception, and indeed to the end of the whole celebration, worshipping, not the Sacrament, but Christ." ("Religion of the Church of England." Edit. Meyrick. Rivingtons, p. 44.)

Cosin desired to have this practice distinctly enjoined. In his paper of "particulars to be considered," it is set down: "LX. There wants likewise an Order, for the People to continue kneeling at their Prayers and Devotions (as is most meet) during all the time of the holy Action." (See Nicholls's Additional Notes, etc., p. 69.)

ministered apart, which is a demonstration that we have NOT there *His entire living person*. And therefore it doth not follow, that because we have the true and real *representatives* of His body and blood, and that they are as beneficial to us as if we had the Principals, that therefore divine honour is to be paid to them. For I am fully persuaded (to express myself in the words of our Church) that *no adoration* ought to be done, either to the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or to any corporal presence of Christ's body and blood." ("The Propitiatory Oblation in the Eucharist, truly Stated and Defended," p. 31; London, 1710.)

The book was published anonymously, but was attributed to John Johnson, the author of "The Unbloody Sacrifice."

With Johnson's testimony may be compared the following from Bishop George Hooper (of Bath and Wells):—

"Kneeling at the communion is far . . . from being popish; that is, either a corruption or superstition. The Papists, indeed, kneel to the host, as to their God; but not so particularly then when they receive it, as when, immediately after consecration, it is elevated, and shown to them for that purpose by the priest. But we that kneel when we receive the Communion, kneel not to, it but at it. And what posture can there be fitter for those that, in the deepest sense of their own unworthiness, and of God's unexpressible mercy, are going to take the SEAL of their pardon, and the PLEDGE of their salvation? What better posture would they have for those, that at that time are to be in the highest acts of devotion, the most relenting contrition, and the most dutiful thanksgiving? If on that occasion the papists kneel too, and with a wrong intention, why should any fault of theirs hinder me from expressing my duty? What they do on no reason, why should not I do on the best; especially when we have so solemnly DISCLAIMED theirs, and so expressly declared our own? As we are not to disuse the holy Sacrament because the papists have made it an idol, so may we continue our reverence, though they have paid it adoration." (Works, vol. i., p. 8; Edit. Oxford, 1855.)

Further evidence will be found above, pp. 309, 310, 386, 387.

It will be seen, I think, that this Declaration was regarded by our English Divines as such a sufficient and unmistakeable disclaimer of anything like the Eucharistic worship of the Church of Rome, as ought not only to be an effectual safeguard against all thought of directing worship to the elements, or any divine presence in or under the elements, but also to repel all charges made against the Church of England of running the risk of having her injunction of kneeling so misunderstood as to lead to any such adoration. (See Bishop Hall's Works, vol. ix., p. 374; Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

It was in their judgment a grievous wrong to the Church of England, to lay to her such a charge. It was to charge her with that from which this rubric ought quite unmistakeably to have cleared her.

What would these English divines have thought, if they had been told that among the Church of England's own sons would rise those

who would actually seek to introduce into the practice of the Church of England that adoration, the very risk of which they judged to be removed for ever—and would maintain that this rubric contained no condemnation of any such presence, or of any such adoration of that presence, as was taught by the Church of Rome ?

Note II, p. 307.

When Dr. Pusey says—"Plainly, the word 'corporal,' which they admitted, could not in their minds mean the same as 'real and essential,' which they rejected" (Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 224 ; see also Sequel to Kiss of Peace, p. 321 ; and Grueber's Reply to Dr. Heurtley, p. 330, sqq. ; and Bishop Forbes on Articles, ii., p. 547)—he seems to have overlooked the fact, that the two phrases having been often used as *convertible*, there might be very good reason for preferring to express the *same thing* in language which our Divines *never* claimed as their own, rather than in language which, as applied to Eucharistic reception, many eminent Divines *had claimed* for ourselves and for the doctrine of our Reformed Church.

That the change from "real and essential" to "corporal presence" was not without sufficient cause, will be apparent, I think, to all who will observe—

(1) That in the earlier period of the English Reformed Church the expression "Real Presence" unexplained was commonly rejected by our Reformers, and regarded as expressing the Romish doctrine, though doubtless with explanation it was sometimes accepted by them. The following examples may be taken in proof of this.

Cranmer speaks of "the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the *Real Presence*." (On Lord's Supper, p. 6.) And again he says—"Not long before I wrote the said Catechism, I was in that error of the *Real Presence*." (Ibid. p. 374.)

Ridley says—"The blood is in the chalice indeed, but NOT IN THE REAL PRESENCE, but by grace and in a sacrament." (Works, p. 238.)

Jewel argues at length against "the *Real Presence*," and speaks of "these NEW-FANGLED WORDS, '*really*,' '*corporally*,' '*carnally*,' etc. Which words M. Harding is not able to show that, in this case of BEING REALLY in the Sacrament, any one of all the old Fathers ever used." (Sermon and Harding, p. 449.)

So Foxe, speaking of the difference between the Lutherans and the Sacramentaries, says—"They both . . . do confess the presence of Christ, and disagree only upon the manner of the presence, which the one part do affirm to be *real*, and the other *spiritual*." (Acts and Monuments, vol. v., p. 11.)

Hence in the 29th Article of 1553, we have "real and corporal" coupled as expressive of the doctrine rejected. "A faithful man ought not either to believe or openly to confess the real and bodily (*realem et corporalem*) presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood."

(2) That when, in the earlier period of the English Reformed Church, the expression "Real Presence" or "Real Essential Presence" was accepted, it was always accepted with explanation; and that in that explanation the "corporal" or "bodily" or "carnal" presence was commonly excluded.

It is true indeed that in 1555 Bradford accepted the words "corporally present," with explanation (Sermons, etc., p. 480), and that Dean Aldrich acknowledges the words as capable of being used in a sound sense. (Quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," i., p. 39.) But the example must be regarded as exceptional, and unsupported by the use of succeeding Divines.

Thus Ridley, accepting "A REAL PRESENCE" (p. 213), explains that if meant of "the real and CORPORAL substance," THAT presence "cannot be on the earth," and (p. 236) denies that it is "by the CORPORAL presence of the body of His flesh." But (p. 274) he acknowledges the presence, "vere et realiter," for "SPIRITUALLY, by grace and efficacy." Again, he speaks of "A SPIRITUAL presence by grace, and not after any CORPORAL SUBSTANCE of His flesh taken of the Virgin Mary." (Page 249.)

Thus Latimer acknowledges "none other presence than a SPIRITUAL presence;" but adds, "The same may be called a REAL PRESENCE." (Remains, p. 252.)

Thus Philpot acknowledges "a very ESSENTIAL presence"—yea, "a REAL presence" (p. 130)—but denies the being present "bodily." (Page 208.)

Thus Hooper acknowledges "Christum . . . adesse . . . quoad corporis ejus *gratiam*, sed NON quoad *corporis* ejus SUBSTANTIAM." (Later Writings, p. 394.)

Thus Haddon: "Corpus Christi REALITER adest Sacramentis corporis et sanguinis sui vere ex Christi institutione administratis. Intellige REALITER pro *vere et non fecte*, sacramentaliter NON *autem* CARNALITER." (Haddon's Opinion of the Presence, 1553; given in Collier's Eccles. History, vol. ix., 301.)

Thus Hooker:—"They [the ancient Fathers] teach that Christ is PERSONALLY there PRESENT—yea, *present whole*, albeit a part of Christ be CORPORALLY ABSENT from thence." (Keble Edit., vol. ii., p. 357.)

(3) That when subsequent English Divines claimed and appropriated the phrase "Real Presence," as expressing the doctrine of our Church, they did not thus claim and appropriate the phrase "Corporal Presence," which was thus left to express that doctrine of the opponents, which had at an earlier period been expressed by the phrase "Real Presence."

Thus Jeremy Taylor, in his treatise on "The Real Presence," says—"I suppose we do in no sense prevaricate this so pious and prudent counsel by saying, THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST IS REAL AND SPIRITUAL." (The capitals are his own. Sec. i., 2.) And though he acknowledges that the word "corporally" may become "warrantable and consonant to our doctrine," yet he says (sec. i., 9)—"That

which seems of hardest explication is the word *corporaliter*, which I find that Melancthon used; saying, *Corporaliter quoque communicatione carnis Christi Christum in nobis habitare*; which manner of speaking I have heard he avoided after he had conversed with Ecolampadius, who was able then to teach him and most men in that question." (See Archbishop Wake in Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. x., p. 70.)

So Bishop Morton, while maintaining, like Taylor, "the Real Presence," devotes the *fourth* book of his work on the Eucharist to "The Corporal Presence," the title of which is—"Treating of the Second Romish Consequence, arising from the False Exposition of these words of Christ ['This is my body'] called CORPORAL PRESENCE in the Sacrament of the Eucharist." And the second section of the first chapter is headed thus: "That Protestants, albeit they deny the CORPORAL PRESENCE of Christ in this Sacrament; yet hold they a TRUE Presence thereof in divers respects; according to the judgment of antiquity."

Bishop Andrewes says—"Præsentiam (inquam) credimus, nec minus quam vos, veram. De modo præsentiae nil temere definimus; non magis quam, in baptismo nostro, quomodo abluat nos sanguis Christi." (Responso ad Bellarm., p. 13.)

On which words Archbishop Wake has said—"He [Andrewes] plainly insinuates that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist was much the same as in Baptism; the very allusion which the holy Fathers were wont to make to express His presence by in this holy Sacrament; which since our adversaries can neither deny, nor yet say is *so real* as to be *essential* or CORPOREAL, they must of necessity allow, that there may be a true presence (which is all the Bishop affirms) without such a substantial one as this author here contends for." (Archbishop Wake's "Discourse of the Holy Eucharist," in Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. x., p. 69. See also pp. 70, 71.)

L'Estrange speaks of "that REAL presence which all sound Protestants seem to allow." (*Alliance of Divine Offices*, Edit. Oxford, p. 323.) But the phrase CORPORAL Presence was distinctly disallowed by Archbishop Laud. (See Bulley's *Variations*, p. 184.)

Hammond says—"Bestowing that body and blood of Christ upon us . . . REALLY." (Hammond's *Practical Catechism*, p. 129.) "The faithful do receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, which implies not any CORPORAL PRESENCE of Christ on the table or in the elements, but God's communicating the crucified Saviour (who is in Heaven bodily, and nowhere else) to us sinners on the earth." (*Ibid.* p. 126.)

In like manner, Archbishop Laud (*Conference with Fisher*, p. 247) says—"PROTESTANTS OF ALL SORTS maintain a true and REAL presence of Christ in the Eucharist." But the seventh English Canon of 1640 disclaims "any opinion of a CORPORAL Presence of the body of Jesus Christ, on the holy table, or in mystical elements." (*Cardwell's Synodalia*, vol. i., p. 406.)

Again—Archbishop Laud quotes with approval the words of

Cranmer: "If you understand by this word *REALLY*, *reipsa*; that is, in *very deed and effectually*; so Christ, by the grace and efficacy of His passion, is *indeed and truly* PRESENT, etc. But if by this word *really* you understand CORPORALITER, CORPORALLY in His natural and organical body, under the forms of bread and wine, it is CONTRARY TO THE HOLY WORD OF GOD." (Conference with Fisher, p. 248.)

Heylin gives it as the ground for the omission of this rubric (as well as for the change in the form of administration) in Elizabeth's reign, "lest, under colour of rejecting a *carnal*, they might be thought also to deny SUCH a *Real Presence* as was defended in the writings of the ancient Fathers." (History of Reformation, E. H. S. Edit., pp. 285, 286.)

So John Owen says—"One of the greatest engines that ever the devil made use of to overthrow the faith of the Church, was, by forging *such a presence of Christ* as is *not truly* in this ordinance, to drive us off from looking after *that great presence* which is TRUE. I look upon it as one of the greatest engines that ever hell set on work. It is NOT a CORPOREAL presence. Every thing that is in sense, reason, and the faith of a man, overthrows that CORPOREAL presence." (Works, Edit. Gould, vol. ix., p. 572.) Yet Owen speaks of Christ as "*REALLY exhibited*" and "*REALLY communicated*" (p. 617), and "*the reception . . . REALLY.*" (Page 621.)

(4) Add to this, that the phrase "CORPORAL PRESENCE" was accepted and pleaded for by Lutherans, as expressing the doctrine which was held in common by themselves, the Roman Church, and the Greek Church (see quotations in "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 624) but not by the Reformed, who yet did not reject the phrase "Real Presence."

Ursinus says, "*Isthæc præsentia ac perceptio tum corporis tum sanguinis Domini, tametsi spiritualis non corporalis, nec oralis est; essentialis tamen ac vera est.*" (Solida Refutatio Cavillationum Theol. Wirtemb: in Works, vol. ii., p. 363. Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.) Again, "*Confitendo VERAM præsentiam . . . multum abest, ut corporalem, oralem . . . confiteri quis præsumatur.*" (Ibid. p. 367.)

The *Declaratio Thoruniensis* also (1645) in like manner, clearly confesses a most *real*, while distinctly denying a *corporal* Presence. It says, "*Nequaquam etiam negamus veram Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Cœna Præsentiam, sed tantum localem et corporalem Modum, et Unionem cum Elementis substantialem: ipsam vero nobiscum Præsentiam sancte Credimus, et quidem non imaginariam, sed verissimam, realissimam et efficacissimam.*" (In Niemeyer's *Collectio Confessionum*, p. 682. See above, § 7.)

"All," says D'Aubigné, concluding the account of the Conference at Marburg—"Romanists and Evangelicals, Saxons and Swiss—admitted the presence, and even the REAL PRESENCE, of Christ." (History of the Reformation, p. 346.) But in the preceding page we have Luther's words, declaring—"We are not agreed on the

subject whether the real body and blood of Christ are CORPORALLY present in the bread and wine." (See Edgar's *Variations of Popery*, p. 7; and especially Hospinian, vol. iv., pp. 128, 129.)

The "Consensus Orthodoxus" of Gualter speaks of the calumny against the Reformed, "*Quod veram Christi in cœna præsentiam negent, quasi non aliter quam per corporalem carnis præsentiam, sacramentis suis vere adesse possit Christus.*" (Edit. 1605, p. 255.) Again:—"*Etsi præsentia Christi non sit corporalis, recte tamen dici potest esse realis.*" (Ibid. p. 259.)

In the Westminster Confession of Faith it is said—"The body and blood of Christ being then, NOT CORPORALLY or carnally, in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as REALLY, but spiritually, PRESENT to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses." (Edit. 1658, p. 100.)

(5) Add yet the following statements from men¹ who were themselves engaged in the last review of the Prayer Book, at which the Black Rubric was restored.

"We teach also a REAL PRESENCE of Christ's body . . . by the means of the *real operation* and *effectual efficacy* of GRACE." (Sheldon, Bp. London: quoted in Garbett's *Voices of the Church of England*, p. 54.)

"It is not the taking of Christ's body into our mouths, in the very flesh or CORPOREAL substance of it (if it could be so taken) that can nourish us spiritually . . . but it is the *Spirit*, saith *Christ*, that *quickeneth*, that is, it is the SPIRITUAL *eating* of His flesh and drinking of His blood, that nourisheth us." (Bishop Morley of Worcester, quoted in Garbett's *Voices of the Church of England*, p. 53.)

Bishop Reynolds (the writer, probably, of our General Thanksgiving—see Cardwell's Conf., p. 372), asserting it to be "both absurd and impious" to affirm Christ "really and CORPORALLY present with the consecrated elements, severed from the act of faithful receiving," yet declares—"A REAL *presence* of Christ we acknowledge, but not local or physical; for *presence* REAL (that being a metaphysical term) is not opposed unto a mere physical or local absence or distance, but is opposed to a false, imaginary, fantastic presence;" adding—"What presence fitter for a spiritual union than a SPIRITUAL *presence*?" (Meditations on the Holy Sacrament; in Works, Edit. 1826, vol. iii., pp. 69, 72, 73.)

Bishop Nicholson says—"This presence of His is REAL, . . . for He is TRULY and EFFECTUALLY there present, though NOT CORPORALLY, BODILY, carnally, locally." (Nicholson, Bp. Gloucester: Exposition of Catechism, p. 217.)

The following testimonies may be added as showing that the

¹ Sheldon and Morley and Reynolds had previously been on the Savoy Commission. Morley and Nicholson were on the Commission appointed by the Upper House of Convocation to prepare the Book for revision. (See Cardwell's *Conferences*, pp. 370, 371.) This Committee, however, appears to have been almost superseded by the action of Convocation itself. (See Cardwell, p. 371.)

distinction was preserved by succeeding Divines. "This REAL PRESENCE of Christ in the sacrament, His Church hath always believed. But the monstrous notion of HIS BODILY PRESENCE was started 700 years after His death." (Archbishop Secker, quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 724.)

"The body and blood of Christ are taken and received by the faithful, not substantially, not CORPORALLY, but verily and indeed, that is, effectually. The sacred symbols are no bare signs, no untrue figures of a thing absent; but the force, the grace, the virtue, and benefit of Christ's body broken and blood shed, that is, of His passion, are really and effectually present with all them that receive worthily. This is all the REAL Presence that our Church teaches." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 42.)

Much more evidence of the same kind might be adduced, but more seems to be needless.

At a time when the phrase "Real Presence" had come to signify a doctrine which was acknowledged to be held by *Protestants generally*, (see Paper No. VI., p. 237) even those most opposed to anything like the Real Objective Presence; at a time when "the Corporal Presence" was commonly understood to be the designation of the doctrine of Papists and Lutherans—it were strange indeed, if the change made in the "Declaration" were to be regarded as unaccountable save on the supposition of its being no longer condemnatory of the doctrine taught by Papists and Lutherans.

I add the following valuable observation of Dean Goode:—"One great point for which our divines have contended in opposition to Romish errors, has been the reality of that presence of Christ's body and blood to the soul of the believer which is effected through the operation of the Holy Spirit, notwithstanding the absence of the substance of that body and blood in heaven. Like the sun, the body of Christ is both present and absent: present, really and truly present, in one sense: that is, by the soul being brought into immediate communion with; but absent in another sense, that is, as regards the contiguity of its substance to our bodies. The Authors under review, like the Romanists, maintain that this is not a real presence; and, assuming their own interpretation of the phrase to be the only true one, press into their service the testimony of divines who, though using the phrase, apply it in a sense the reverse of theirs. The ambiguity of the phrase, and its misapplication by the Church of Rome, have induced many of our divines to repudiate it, and our Church, as Dean Aldrich has observed, has wisely forborne its use; but others, for the similar purpose of preventing misconception and meeting the misrepresentations of the Romanists, have maintained and contended for its use. The real doctrine of our divines, therefore, is not to be sought in their use or rejection of this phrase, but in the meaning they attach to it, and their accompanying statements." ("Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 757. See Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., chap. ii.)

Mr. S. C. Malan justly observes, in his work entitled "The Holy

Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to Scripture, Grammar and the Faith" (Nutt):

"The offence some people take at the words 'Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament,' comes from mistaking them. Both Papists and Anglicans use the term 'Real Presence;' the Papists—whether some of the Ritualists, who seem to make a distinction without a difference, differ much from them, I cannot tell—mean by 'Real Presence' that Christ is materially present in the Bread and Wine, or rather that these symbols are changed into His natural flesh and blood; so that they materially and mechanically eat and drink Him; a doctrine so gross, and so forbidding, that the mind turns away with disgust from it, as also from the details into which those who hold it are obliged to enter.

"Whereas Anglicans, such as Jeremy Taylor, Hooker, and other like sober-minded men, understand by Real Presence in the Sacrament, not that Christ forms part of the elements, which after the consecration remain in every respect unchanged, in form, nature, and substance, as Theodoretus says, but that Christ is then especially present in a spiritual or sacramental manner, and that He thus verily communicates Himself in His whole Person, as EMMANUEL, God with us, to every faithful partaker of the Lord's Supper: 'the mean,' says Art. XXVIII., 'whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper being—faith.'" (Pages 127-8. See Bishop O'Brien's Charge, 1866, p. 89.)

Understanding then the words "Real Presence" in that sense in which our English Divines have accepted it, and which stands clearly distinguished from the modern "Real Objective Presence," we may acknowledge as true what has been said concerning the final Revisers, that "they retained the protest against Transubstantiation, while they removed all risk of the Declaration, or 'Black rubric,' as it was sometimes called, being understood as even an *apparent* denial of the truth of the Real Presence." (See J. H. Blunt's "Common Prayer," p. 199, note.)

But then it must not be supposed that *such* a Real Presence had ever been denied or called in question by our Reformers.

Note KK, p. 308.

Let it be asked, and submitted to consideration—May not the disallowance of reservation and elevation be itself admissible as evidence towards proving that the Church of England does not hold the Real Objective Presence? For if such a personal adorable presence, under the form of bread, be held, should it not naturally and rightfully lead to some such provision as is made in the Church of Rome?

Archbishop Sharp has said, "If the consecrated bread be really Christ's body, and His soul and deity be hypostatically united therewith (as they all teach), then I cannot see but that *we are bound* to perform divine worship to the elements in the sacrament,

or to that which in common speech we Protestants call bread and wine." (Works, Edit. Oxford, 1829, pp. 233, 234. See also p. 260. See the same argument urged by Beza in Tract. Theol., vol. i., pp. 262, 311.)¹

"Si apud Catholicos certissimum dogma est, in Eucharistia totum Christum reali sua præsentia existere, quis non videt ac intelligit necessario consequi ipsum ibi esse adorandum, cum ubicunque is præsens adsit, ejusmodi honore et obsequio sit donandus; imo qui secus ageret damnandus foret?" (Migne's Patrologiæ, Tomus lxxiv., p. 1007. Paris, 1850.)

Let the reader mark what this doctrine does lead to at Rome.

The extract following is from the Dublin Review of Jan., 1870:—

"She [Rome] may be said to be the city of the blessed Sacrament, Its tabernacle and throne. In Rome Its worship is perpetual, unbroken even by a moment's pause; and so scrupulously is this provided for by her anxious love, that the deposition of the Sacred Host is not allowed to take place in one church until after it has been elevated in another. At the beginning of the Church's year, on Advent Sunday, the Lamb of God is lifted up on His Sacramental Throne by His own Vicar's hands, in the Cappella Paolina at the Vatican, and from thence the Blessed Presence passes from Basilica to Church, and from Church to Convent, until well-nigh all Rome's holy places have been made holier by the visit of the All Holy. What a thought it is! He Who gave strength to Peter, and conversion to Paul, and purity to Agnes, and victory to all Rome's saints, comes now during that year of ceaseless worship, and rests for forty hours with unspeakable complacency on their glorious shrines! And not an hour of day or night but the poorest, and lowliest, and most forgotten of Rome's children can have audience of the King of Heaven in the city of His saints! Not a morning but the sun rises upon countless altars, upon which the Lamb of God is lying, as it were, slain, and at which God and man are being brought together in His Kiss of Peace; not an evening on which the Sun sinks in glory beneath the western heaven, but the Sun of Justice, which never sets, casts His silent benediction upon kneeling crowds! And He who would have gathered Jerusalem's now scattered children, even as the hen doth her brood, gathers now at Rome the children of her who was once the 'Great Harlot,' under the shadow of His wings!" (Page 41.)

¹ A Lasco says—"Si igitur Christi corpus naturale cum inhabitante in se omni divinitatis plenitudine, ita aut elementis cœnæ ipsis, aut ministri operi unitur, ut vel pani ipsi realiter insit, vel manibus ministri distribuatur omnino: Adorari illud certe oportebit, sive in pane ipso, sive in ministri nescio quo opere: si non Christum Dominum sua gloria fraudare velimus." ("Brevis et Dilucida de Sacramentis Ecclesiæ Christi Tractatio," fo. 132; London, 1552.)

Calvin asks—"Cui persuadebit non esse adorandum panem, qui proprie sit Christus?" (Works, vol. viii., p. 727 b; Amsterdam, 1667.)

Ursinus says—"Si Christus in pane Eucharistico præsens esset corporaliter, necessario nos ad panem conversos operteret ipsi reverentiam et adorationem Deo debitam exhibere." (Works, vol. ii., p. 664 b; Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

Now, why is there nothing of all this in our own Communion? Must not the absence arise from one of two causes? Either that like a cruel mother (which none of her children will believe) the Church of England withholds from her children so great a blessing? Or else, that in faithfulness and love she will not suffer her children to be taught to believe this blessing at all; but will lead them from idolatrous altars to the throne of grace, where all real blessing is to be obtained? Surely, then, she herself can hardly hold the doctrine of this Objective Presence. "How could she hold it," it has been well asked, "and yet forbear to worship?" (Dr. Heurtley's "Remarks on Declaration," p. 12. See "The Real Presence—the worship due."—Rivingtons. Especially pp. 8, 9, 10, and Bishop of St. David's Charge, 1869, p. 62, note. See also the "Autobiography" in "The Church and the World," 1866, and Bishop O'Brien's Charge, 1866, p. 112, sqq.)

Note LL, p. 311.

Thus some have gone so far as to desire that our present Communion Service should be replaced by "a good translation of the Liturgy of St. Peter" (*i.e.* the Mass-book). While others have not hesitated to speak of our present office as "a judgment on the Church." Thus also our Reformers have been charged with mutilating "the tradition of 1500 years," and with giving up altogether "the ecclesiastical tradition regarding certain VERY MATERIAL points in the *celebration*, if not in the doctrine, of the Holy Eucharist." (See Goode's Rule of Faith, vol. ii., p. 363.)

Mr. Orby Shipley (while labouring hard to remove the impression of repugnance between his own views and the teaching of our Liturgy) writes—"It may be well to call to mind to how great an extent the Prayer for Christ's Church, as we now use it, has been *tampered with*, both to the *detriment* of the worshipper, and of the perfection and unity of the Prayer. One part has been contracted, one has been omitted, and one epitomized." ("The Church and the World," 1866, third edition, p. 493.) And again, speaking of the Invocation as it appeared in 1549, he says, "This invocation we have lost, and we can *scarcely too deeply* DEPLORE the loss, or earnestly DESIRE that it may be restored to us." (Ibid.)

Again Mr. Shipley speaks of "those who in 1552 so GRIEVOUSLY MARRED the labour of many years" (p. 476), and of "those abnormal alterations from which we still suffer" (p. 477). The revision of 1552 is regarded by him as "the first *deplorable* DEFORMATION of the labours of the Convocation of 1549" (p. 477). He says that "it is in the sacred Canon that revision has run to the *freest extent* of RIOT;" that The Consecration "is but a shadow of its earlier self," that "The Canon, if it be not irreverent to say so, has been at once *decapitated and curtailed*;" that "it has been *dismembered*; and its dislocated portions have been readjusted with no recognizable organization."¹ (Page 485.)

¹ In a more recent work Mr. Orby Shipley speaks of "the need of some 'clothing upon' of the dry bones of the Anglican Office" (Preface to "Ritual of the

So Mr. Medd speaks of "the *mutilated and dislocated* Liturgy of 1552." ("The Church and the World," 1866; 3rd Edit., p. 313.)

Another writer says that "the *very palpable defects* of our offices, and *principally of our office of offices*, THE EUCHARISTIC SERVICE, are at last coming to be *pretty generally admitted*." (See Blakeney's Common Prayer, Introduction, p. xiv.)

By another it has been said, "It is impossible for any English Liturgical scholar to behold it [our Communion Office] in its present condition and to compare it with the glorious rite of Sarum, or even with Edward VI.'s First Book, without being *bowed down with SHAME, GRIEF, and INDIGNATION* at the ENORMOUS WRONG-DOING which was *perpetrated*, and the apathy with which it has been so long regarded." (See Principles at Stake, p. 13.)

[The Sarum Missal here alluded to contains the following Rubric. "After these words, let the Priest incline to the Host, and with bowed head adore It, and afterwards elevate It above his forehead that It may be seen by the people, and reverently replace It before the Chalice, making a cross with the same; and then let him uncover the chalice and hold it between both hands, not disjoining the thumb from the forefinger, save only to make the sign of the cross." (Sarum Missal, Church Press Company, p. 311.) Also the following Prayer after the Offertory, "Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation which I, an unworthy sinner, offer in Thy honour, Blessed Mary's, and all Thy saints, for my sins and offences; for the salvation of the living and the repose of the faithful departed. In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, let this new Sacrifice be acceptable to Almighty God." (Ibid. p. 298.)

Dr. Blakeney says (On Common Prayer, p. 404) "the very reading of this service is its refutation. Dupin says, in reference to the spurious Liturgy, which bears the name of St. James:—'Who will believe that these things were in use in St. James's time?' We may put a similar question as to the Sarum Service, which is . . . more objectionable:—Who will believe that these things were in use in the time of the Apostles?"]

"In 1838 the British Critic solemnly protested, in the name of the party, that they desired no changes in the Prayer Book, and that what had satisfied Andrewes and Laud would for ever satisfy them . . . *now* the desire of 're-appropriating' whatever was deliberately expunged from our Liturgy at the Reformation is hardly dissembled; and if men are taught to submit to the present Prayer Book, it is to submit in the same spirit as they would to a famine or a pestilence, or a bill of pains and penalties, or any other inevitable affliction." (Cautions for Times, p. 329.)

What Dr. Brett (whose views did not nearly come up to the Altar," p. 55), and of "our mutilated rite for the celebration of sacred mysteries." (Ibid. p. 20.) He regards our Liturgy as only "a wreck of former power, and a shadow of earlier beauty" (Ibid. p. 14),—"a public office, the rules and words of which, oftentimes inadequate, are in some important, though not essential, parts almost defective." (Ibid. p. 17.)

"Real Objective Presence") thought of our Communion Service may be seen in his "Liturgies," pp. 396, sqq. He conceives that by her present Communion Service "the present Church of England" has "departed from the communion of the whole Catholic Church." (Page 461.)

Note MM, p. 311.

The Rev. T. T. Carter thus writes, "Our own Office preserves the distinction [between two offerings], though unhappily on this point there has been a deviation from ancient use in the arrangement of the ritual order, owing to a **STRONG ULTRA-PROTESTANT pressure** at the Reformation. . . . In all the Early Liturgies, as in our own First Prayer Book of Edward, it [the Post-Communion Prayer] stood immediately after the Prayer of Consecration. Its removal from this place was intended probably **TO DO AWAY WITH the close connexion of the words with the consecrated Elements.** But we are not bound by the intentions of those who thus *violated the universal custom of the Church*; nor do we receive our Liturgy as interpreted by the changes which they introduced. . . . No doubt the introduction of the special Roman view of the Real Presence, as it caused a violent reaction against the truth of the Presence itself, so also against the idea of any Sacrifice in the high sense here dwelt on. It was a consequence of this reaction, that *the doctrine of the SACRIFICE HAS BEEN OBSCURED in our PRAYER BOOK*; and the *same influence has acted very extensively on our post-Reformation Divines.* Our later Theology has been greatly influenced by this reactionary movement." (Correspondence with Marriott. Rivingtons, Part ii., pp. 88-90.) Here is the confession of one, whom with sincere regret I must speak of as an opponent. And let the reader mark what this confession amounts to. Is it not a confession of a very considerable portion of what the present Paper has aimed to establish? Surely I am not saying too much or pressing any unnatural deductions out of Mr. Carter's words when I say—Here we have an acknowledgment

1. Of the *clearing* work of our Reformers as applied to the Sacrificial Character of our Communion Service.

2. Of the *animus*, from which this *clearing* resulted, and of which it is evidence. In Mr. Carter's view it is an "Ultra-Protestant" *animus*, shewing itself in a "VIOLENT REACTION against the truth [?] of the Presence" [*i.e.* in the Elements.]. (See p. 90.)

3. Of this same *animus* very extensively pervading our post-Reformation Theology.

4. Of this same *animus*, and its *clearing* work, and therefore [in my view, and I trust, that of my readers, who look at the changes in our Liturgy in connexion with the most obvious historical surroundings] of the character it has stamped on our Communion Service, as being altogether out of tune with the most cherished views of those who maintain "the Real Objective Presence."

I am loth to set down the corollary which to my own mind seems

inevitable—that the Principles of those who maintain the “Real Objective Presence” are so repugnant to the Principles of our Reformed Church and to the doctrines for which many of our Reformers laid down their lives, that if we stand on the side of “the Real Objective Presence,” we must condemn our Reformers as fanatics, and their work as a violation of God’s precious truth. And if, on the contrary, we stand on the side of our Church, our Liturgy, and our Reformers, we must condemn “the Real Objective Presence” and its maintainers as teaching false doctrines, what our Church has rejected as the commandments of men.

The following is from Archbishop Longley: “I will quote something which has occurred within my own special cognizance; we all know the proceedings that are now common, and that statements are constantly made which abundantly prove that there are many who are determined to obliterate from our articles and formularies all traces of the Reformation. I said I would mention something that had occurred in my own diocese. I had a letter from a parent living at the sea-side, in the hands of whose daughter was placed an Eucharistic Manual which contained these words: they are a prayer at the Holy Communion, after the consecration of the Elements,—‘Holy Father, accept the spotless victim which thy servant offers for his own sake and those of all faithful Christians both living and dead, that it may make us worthy of everlasting life.’ Now contrast that with our Thirty-first Article. . . . Put these two side by side, and I do not think any one can venture to say they are not DIAMETRICALLY OPPOSED to each other.” (Speech in Convocation, Feb., 1868, quoted in Principles at Stake, pp. 18, 19.)

Note NN, p. 312.

“Wherefore to avoid all such needless suppositions and needless perplexities, let us be content to teach only this plain doctrine; that we eat Christ crucified in this Sacrament, as we partake of the merits of His death; and if we thus have part in His crucified body, we are thereby *ipso facto* made partakers of the body glorified; that is, we receive our Lord’s body into a closer union than before, and become His members by repeated and stronger ties; provided we come worthily to the holy table, and that there is no just obstacle, on our part, to stop the current of Divine graces. I may shut up this account with the excellent words of Archbishop Cranmer, as follows, only put into the modern spelling, ‘The first Catholic Christian faith is most plain, clear, and comfortable, without any difficulty, scruple, or doubt: that is to say, that our Saviour Christ, although He be sitting in heaven, in equality with His Father, is our life, strength, food, and sustenance; who by His death delivered us from death, and daily nourishes and increases us to eternal life. And in token hereof, He hath prepared bread to be eaten, and wine to be drunk of us in His holy Supper, to put us in remembrance of His said death, and of the celestial feeding, nourishing, increasing, and

of all the benefits which we have thereby : which benefits through faith and the Holy Ghost, are exhibited and given unto all that worthily receive the said holy Supper. This the husbandman at his plough, the weaver at his loom, and the wife at her rock,¹ can remember, and give thanks unto God for the same : this is the very doctrine of the Gospel, with the consent wholly of all the old ecclesiastical doctors.'” (Waterland, vol. iv., pp. 609, 610.)

¹ *Rock*, a distaff: *cf.* the German *Rocken*.

No. VIII.

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

IN our review of the teaching of the English Church, we have been ascending step by step from lower to higher ground. And if, in our upward journey, we have caught sounds from our Church's voice which have spoken clearly on the controversy before us ; there can be no question that when we come within the range of her thirty-nine articles "agreed upon for avoiding Diversities of Opinions," her voice strikes upon the ear at once not as a trumpet giving an uncertain sound, but with a clearness and distinctness, such as scarcely leaves any room for the supposition that perchance our ears may have deceived us, or we may not really have understood her voice aright.

Here are the two Articles which bear most directly on the subject.

XXVIII. *Of the Lord's Supper.*

"The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another ; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death : insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

"Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

"The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

“The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was not by Christ’s ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.”

XXIX. *Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord’s Supper.*

“The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ; but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.”

Now, in viewing these Articles it must be remembered, that it is insisted upon as of the very essence of the “Real Objective” view, that, after consecration, there is, of necessity, under the forms of bread and wine, such a Presence of the real body and blood of Christ, altogether independent of use, independent of participation, as that, in the reception of the Elements, (unless this Presence be withdrawn) there must of necessity be a reception of the body and blood of Christ, quite independent of worthiness, quite independent of faith. According to this view he who partakes of the sacramental sign, he who takes and eats the consecrated elements, must needs partake of the *res sacramenti*, must needs take, and eat, and drink the body and blood of Christ.

Let the reader look at these Articles with a view to enquire whether this teaching is their teaching. There can be no question, I think, that his answer, on the *prima facie* view, will be “No.” He will naturally ask: If these Articles meant to teach this doctrine, why is it said, that there is a partaking of the *res sacramenti*, to such as “rightly, worthily and *with faith* receive” the sacrament? Why is it said that the body and blood of Christ are “given, taken and eaten only after an heavenly and spiritual manner”? Why is it said that “the mean” whereby they are received “is *faith*”? Above all, why is it expressly declared that those who are void of a lively faith, however they may receive the sacrament, eat not Christ’s body in the use of the Lord’s Supper,¹ and are *in no wise* partakers of Christ?

¹ With the teaching of our Church in these Articles (as well as in the Catechism, and the Black Rubric) the reader may be glad to compare the following statements of the Reformed Theologians at the Conference of Thorn, 1645. “Constat igitur hoc Sacramentum Rebus terrenis, Pane et Vino, et Cœlestibus, Corpore et Sanguine Domini, quæ diverso quidem modo, utræque autem verissime, realissime ac præ-

It must be, I think, sufficiently obvious, that in these Articles (as understood in their natural sense) the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence can find nothing to support their own views, nothing which they can truly claim as speaking at all in their favour.¹

The first aspect² of this language is too evidently repugnant to their own distinct declarations of what they hold as "*de fide*." The natural and obvious sense which³ they bear is too

sentissime nobis exhibentur; nempe, Terrenæ modo Naturali, Corporali et Terreno: Cælestes vero *Spirituali*, Mystico et *Cælesti*, quem Rationi et Sensui inscrutabilem sola *Fide* tenemus; qua Verba promissionis, et Rem ipsam promissam, videlicet Christum Crucifixum cum omnibus suis beneficiis, apprehendimus. . . . Nec ullam Inclusionem, Inexistentiam, Coexistentiam, aut localem et *Corporalem* Præsentiam, aut talem Elementorum cum Christi Corpore unionem, per quam illud Oraliter tam ab indignis et *impiis*, quam a fidelibus, *manducetur*. . . .

"Etsi quoque Adorationem Christi (quam cæteroqui in Actione Sacræ Cœnæ vel maxime necessariam esse ultro fatemur) non ad ipsa elementa, aut corpus aliquod invisibile sub iis latens, sed ad Christum ipsum ad dextram Patris gloriose regnantem, dirigimus: Nequaquam tamen statuimus nuda, vacua, inania Signa, sed potius id quod significant, et obsignant, simul exhibentia, tanquam certissima media, et *efficacia Instrumenta*, per quæ Corpus et Sanguis Christi adeoque Christus ipse, cum omnibus suis beneficiis singulis vescentibus exhibetur seu offertur, *credentibus* vero *donatur*, et ab ipsis in cibum animæ salutarem et vivificum *acceptatur*." (*Declaratio Thoruniensis*; in Niemeyer's *Collectio Confessionum*, pp. 681, 682.)

¹ A claim, indeed, has been made for an "Objective" sound in the words "given, taken, and eaten." I am supposing, however, that the readers of this Paper, have already read Paper No. VI., and have been satisfied with the arguments adduced in pp. 253-257, that the true and natural interpretation of the words can yield no support to the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. See also note D in Appendix, pp. 486, sqq.

² As regards Art. 29th, Archdeacon Denison says, "I do not wish to speak of Article XXIX. as though it presented no difficulty. Upon the face of it, it *does*, doubtless, present a difficulty, and no man can be surprised that it should be commonly quoted, instanced, and appealed to, as *proving* that what is set out in my Proposition, 'is not the doctrine of the Church of England.'" (Three Sermons, p. 80.)

³ How forced and unnatural the other interpretation is, must surely appear clearly to unprejudiced minds from the following words of Archdeacon Denison, "Thus it appears from Articles xxv., xxviii., xxix., taken in connexion, that there are:—1. Those who both *receive* and *partake* of the body and blood of Christ. 2. THOSE WHO RECEIVE, BUT DO NOT PARTAKE OF, THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST."

Dean Goode observes "Unfortunately for the Archdeacon, beyond the difficulty which arises from the words *themselves*, it so happens (as he himself is obliged to confess) that in the Communion Service 'the words *partake*, *partakers*, are used in contexts which *do not restrict* their use to those worthily receiving, but extend it to those unworthily receiving.'" (See "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 655.)

As to the natural sense of Article xxix. shortly after the period of its adoption, further evidence may be adduced from the connexion in which it is placed in the Articles of the Irish Church, 1615. (See "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 665.)

As to the natural sense of the Article both at that and subsequent periods further evidence may be gathered from the interpretation given by ALL the Commentators for two centuries succeeding their final settlement in 1571. (See "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 665, sqq.)

distinctly a repudiation of what is as the very essence of their teaching.

Clearly (I think) those who stand—with our Reformers—in a position of strong and decided opposition to the Corporal Presence, have in these Articles a stronghold all their own. The fortress is entirely in their possession. What they have to do is to defend alone and not to attack. The tactics of their opponents are necessarily confined to attempts to scale or make breaches in the strong wall of exclusion, by endeavouring to show that the Articles cannot mean to say plainly, what they obviously seem to say so very distinctly.

I have in this Paper to fulfil, what I cannot but regard as a sacred duty in the cause of the Truth, which I am persuaded our Reformers have by these Articles delivered and left us to maintain, as Trustees of that, which they counted not their lives dear unto them, that they might bequeath it as a heritage to their children.¹ And, in endeavouring to fulfil this duty, as in God's sight, and in defence of His Truth, it will be only necessary for me to show that these attempts to take away from the distinctness of our Church's utterances in these Articles, are found upon examination, unable to make one fissure in our walls, and must therefore only tend to make our position more strong, and manifest the weakness of our opponents' weapons.

The assaults will be found to be hottest around Article the twenty-ninth. And in repelling them I shall have to meet objections, which may be put in the form of an endeavour to maintain—

I. That however in ordinary language this Article may seem opposed to the Real Objective Presence, yet in correct theological language it may be otherwise.

II. That this exclusion of the natural by the theological sense of the words is supported by the known opinions (1) of Archbishop Parker, (2) of Bishops Cheney and Geste, and (3) of St. Augustine.

These allegations I will proceed, therefore, to deal with in their order.

¹ "Let all the harmony of Protestant confessions be consulted, and see if we are not of the harmony, and our Articles do not conspire with theirs; if ours are not as express and as directly opposite to the Roman Church; if there can be any hopes of reconciling us, sooner than of reconciling them." (Bishop George Hooper, of Bath and Wells. Works, vol. i., p. 4. Edit. Oxford, 1855.)

But first, it may be well to repel any preconception which may have arisen from the use of the phrase "effectual signs" in a previous article, as if these words carried with them a Real Objective character, which must needs set something like a Romish or Lutheran impress on our Church's teaching concerning the Eucharist.

To remove any such misconception,¹ it will suffice to point to the language of some few of our Reformers, that by their use of the like phrase—along with the rejection of the Lutheran Real Presence—it may be clear that the phrase in our Reformation language bears no such character and can stamp no such impress.

The following quotation from Archbishop Whitgift will be found direct to the purpose. "You know very well that we teach far otherwise, and that it is a certain and true doctrine of all such as profess the gospel, that the outward signs of the sacrament do not contain in them grace, neither yet that the grace of God is of necessity tied unto them, but only that they be seals of God's promises, notes of Christianity, testimonies and EFFECTUAL signs of the grace of God, and of our redemption in Christ Jesus, by the which the Spirit of God doth invisibly work in us, not only the increase of faith, but confirmation also." (Works, iii., p. 382.)

And the following from Archbishop Sandys equally so; "A natural body doth not occupy sundry places at once. Here we have a sacrament, a SIGN, a memorial, a commemoration, a representation, a figure EFFECTUAL of the body and blood of Christ." (Sermons, p. 88.)

So also again, "As the graces of God purchased for us by Christ are offered unto us by the word, so are they also most lively and *effectually* by the sacraments."² (Ibid. p. 302.)

In the use of such language, indeed, our Reformers were but speaking as Bullinger also spoke.³ See Decades, v., 314, where he is vindicating his doctrine of the sacraments against

¹ Dr. Pusey says "The framers of our Articles, while using the words of this Article [*i.e.* the Article quoted by the Zuinglians as confirming their opinion], in the hope of winning the foreign Protestants, supplied what was lacking in these words, 'Sacraments—be certain sure witnesses and *effectual* (*efficacia*) signs of *grace* and God's good will towards us, by the which *He doth work invisibly in us.*'" (See "The Real Presence from the Fathers," p. 38, note. See also Sequel to Kiss of Peace, p. 365.)

² See Appendix, Note A, as to the sense of this word "effectual."

³ Calvin also taught "*vere et efficaciter exhiberi, non autem naturaliter.*" (Quoted in Waterland, vol. iv., p. 600.) Jeremy Taylor speaks of the elements as "the EFFICACIOUS SIGNS." (Real Presence, Sect. iii. 9, vol. vi., p. 32.)

those who would make him say that they "differ nothing from profane SIGNS." And his words are, "They are EFFECTUAL, and not without force." And again he says (p. 321) "Sacraments have a greater and more EFFECTUAL force than any sealed charters can have."

Clearly therefore, there is nothing in these words but what properly belonged to the language of those who most emphatically denied the Corporal Presence.

We may, therefore, proceed at once to deal with the first allegation which is brought against our claim to the twenty-ninth Article as altogether our own—

I. That however in ordinary language its declaration may seem opposed to the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, yet in correct theological language it may be quite otherwise.

There are many, I think, who, having been brought under the influence of Modern Teachers, are led to range themselves on the side of the Real Objective Presence, and to do so under the persuasion that they are only defending our Church's true teaching. And if to any one such I were to point out the force of this Article, and its distinct bearing on the subject, its denial that in the Lord's Supper such as be void of a lively faith are any ways partakers of Christ, and therein its denial of that which is regarded as such a test of true doctrine by our opponents; then I should expect, that such a one would tell me at once, that I was misapprehending the very point of the Article, that in the theological language in which it is written, the phrase "partakers of Christ" is equivalent to "partakers of the benefits of Christ's Presence and reception in the Sacrament," that in such language there is no denial of the real receiving of Christ's body and blood under the form of bread and wine in the Eucharist, but only a teaching that such reception cannot be beneficial without faith.

And if I should ask such a one for any evidence of the use of such theological language running so counter to what may be called the ordinary and natural use of language in this matter, I should expect him readily to turn to three or four books on his table, and show me one passage after another, taken from his favourite authors, in which this sense is *very clearly* marked upon these words *indeed*, being in almost if not quite every case, set down immediately afterwards or included in an explanatory parenthesis. But to all these passages thus set before me I have one great objection to make, that they all come from the writings of those who, to maintain their position, are

bound to make their language tally with the language of the Article, and that, how little *that* naturally tallies with their own language and their own views, is manifest by these passages being so constantly followed by this explanatory parenthesis. I wish to speak no hard words when I say, that such theological language cannot but fall under the suspicion of being language made on purpose.

I must ask to have examples of this strange use of theological language of a somewhat less recent date.¹ I ASK TO SEE ONE EXAMPLE OF ITS USE IN THE WRITINGS OF THE REFORMERS.

I say that if the allegation is to be made good, it can only be made good by evidence brought from examples somewhere near the date of the composition of our Articles. I give the whole period from the commencement of the Reformation to the end of the reign of Elizabeth, and I ask of those who maintain this use of theological language in our Article, to produce within that period SOME ONE EXAMPLE TO ESTABLISH THEIR POSITION.

Till such examples are produced, I am quite sure it must be pronounced nothing more than reasonable, if we decline to take the evidence produced from modern English writers writing in defence of "The Real Objective Presence," and claiming it as the teaching of the English Church. We shall see as we proceed, how utterly this language is unlike the language of the English Reformation.

For, we observe, that though not concerned as Modern Authors are to make their language agree with the teaching of

¹ Dean Comber indeed has said—"There must be a change in us, or else though Christ's natural flesh and blood were here, and we should eat and drink thereof every day, we could *not partake of Christ*." (Companion to Temple. Edit. Oxford, 1841, vol. iii., pp. 247, 248.) But then it must be observed that this is very different indeed from saying we should "IN NO WISE be *partakers of Christ*." And the sense in which it is said "we could not partake" is made very obvious by the context. The words following are "It is our eating with faith and penitence, love and holy purposes, that *makes it to be* Christ's body and blood to us." Comber died 1699.

Falling short as it does of the requirements of the case (to justify the position of the Ritualists), Comber's language is, I think, *very unusual and exceptional*. But much earlier examples are what are asked for, and these spoken as "when the *VERY truth* cometh in discussion." See below, p. 413.

Dean Jackson says, "Christ might be *locally* present . . . and yet *not really* present." (See above, p. 279.) But certainly he could not have said that thus He would be *in NO WISE present*.

One side of a truth may be forcibly expressed by such paradoxes : and the use and application made of them may sufficiently guard them from misapprehension. But they are obviously out of place when the *VERY truth* of any matter is in question : and nothing could justify their insertion in an Article of Religion.

our Article, yet the Romanists at the time of the Reformation were of necessity concerned to make their own language agree with that language of Scripture (and the Fathers,) on which the teaching of our Article rests as on a sure foundation :¹

¹ I think Dr. Pusey's argument (in "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 251-256) would not unfairly be gathered up in such words as these—"The article is clearly denying reception by the wicked in the same sense as reception is spoken of in Scripture, and especially in John vi. But in John vi. and other Scriptures what is spoken of is clearly *fruitful* eating and partaking." No doubt. But do the words in John vi. ever speak of *more than one* sort of reception? Is there anything to imply the *possibility of unfruitful* reception? Nay. Is there not there that which excludes the possibility of unfruitful reception? Whatever answer to the last Question Dr. Pusey might give, Dr. Pusey, I am sure, will acknowledge that our Reformers (including Ridley,—see above, No. 2, p. 34, note) would have answered without a doubt "Yes. Unfruitful reception is excluded. For Christ speaks ONLY of one sort of reception. And it is that sort of reception *only* whereby the receiver has everlasting life. The *reception* which our Saviour speaks of is *beneficial*. In His teaching 'TO EAT' is 'TO LIVE.'" Take, by way of example, the following . . . "What need we any other witness, when Christ Himself doth testify the matter so plainly, that whosoever eateth His flesh and drinketh His blood hath everlasting life; and that to eat His flesh and to drink His blood is to believe in Him, and whosoever believeth in Him hath everlasting life? Whereof it followeth necessarily, that ungodly persons, (being limbs of the Devil,) do not eat Christ's flesh nor drink His blood, except the Papists would say that such have everlasting life." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 207.) "Throughout the Scriptures this word 'unworthily' is never joined with Christ's body, never with His blood, for THEY do SANCTIFY their RECEIVERS." (Hutchinson's Works, p. 264. See p. 265; see also Bradford, Sermons, etc., p. 91, and Bilson as quoted above, p. 69.)

And is not this same answer, in fact, contained in the words of our Article? I do not think Dr. Pusey will maintain that there is any eating "after a heavenly and spiritual manner" which is *not fruitful* eating. But our Article teaches unmistakably that there is no other eating of the *res sacramenti* at all, save "only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." How can this then be anything less than a denial of there being *any* eating of the body of Christ, which can be *unfruitful*?

Dr. Waterland has well said "The propositions [in John vi.] are *universal affirmatives*. . . . The sum is: ALL that feed upon what is here mentioned have life; and ALL that do not feed thereupon have no life." (Vol. iv., p. 536.)

And so Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "The sacraments indeed and symbols, the exterior part and ministries may be taken unto condemnation, but THE FOOD ITSELF never." (Vol. viii., p. 17.)

So Barrow, "Whereas our Lord saith, that *whoso eateth His flesh and drinketh His blood hath eternal life*, and CONSEQUENTLY supposeth, that *bad men* do NOT PARTAKE of HIS BODY AND BLOOD; yet they [the Papists, Trid. Conc: Sess. 13, cap. 8] condemn this assertion under a curse." (Of the Pope's Supremacy. Works, 1683. Vol. i., Part 2, p. 285.)

So Beveridge, "Truly we need not go far to prove this, even that wicked men do not eat the body and blood of Christ; for if they eat the body and blood of Christ they are not wicked men, but such as dwell in Christ, and have Christ dwelling in them; as Christ Himself assures us, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him*. John vi. 26." (On Articles. Edit. Oxford, p. 492.)

Bellarmino has no way of reconciling our Saviour's words with the doctrine of Rome but by saying "Respondeo, verba Domini intelligi cum conditione, si rite manducetur." (De Eucharistiâ, Lib. i., cap. vii. See also Foxe's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi., p. 517.) But what can be more absolute and unconditional than these sayings of our Lord?

and hence, when driven by disputation with our Reformers to make their language agree with this language of Scripture and the Fathers, they resorted to exactly the same expedients as those of our Modern Ritualists, *i.e.* they endeavoured to escape from the difficulty of their position as maintaining a doctrine which necessarily involved the reception by the wicked—when pressed with such sayings as teach that they who eat Christ live by Him—they endeavoured, I say, to escape from this difficulty by maintaining just the distinction which our Modern Teachers maintain, between a *Real* receiving and an *effectual* or *beneficial* receiving. And was the distinction allowed by our Reformers?

Nay. I should not do very wrong if I were to say it was laughed by them to scorn, it was tossed by them to the winds. When Harpsfield thus in conference with Bradford would maintain that the wicked do receive the VERY BODY of Christ, but not the GRACE of His body, Bradford's reply is "No. They receive *NOT the body*: for Christ's body is no dead carcass: he that receiveth it receiveth the Spirit, which is not without grace, I ween." (Sermons, etc., p. 512.)

When Harding thus in controversy with Jewel, makes a real receiving one thing and effectual receiving another, Jewel has no other answer than this, that this is a very *real and effectual* folly.¹

Again, when Campion the Jesuit would make the same distinction, saying "The wicked eat not Christ effectually and worthily, according to invisible grace," thus he is answered by Goade, "You answer not mine argument out of Augustine; and as for your words and distinction, it is too absurd to separate the eating of Christ Himself from effectual or worthy eating, seeing that whosoever eateth Christ the substance of the sacrament doth live for ever, and so consequently must needs eat Him effectually." (See "A true report of the disputation, etc., with Edwd. Campion, 1581." London, 1583. Third day's Conference. Argument 10.)

Thus, Gardiner, pressed by Cranmer with a saying of St. Augustine, seeks to evade its force by saying "that is not *worthily and well* done, may (because the principal intent faileth) be called *not* done," putting this gloss on St. Augus-

¹ "The distinction . . . is nothing else but a very 'effectual' and 'real' folly. For the very body of Christ, if it be not effectually received, is not received. Christ Himself saith, 'He that eateth Me shall live by Me.'" (Defence of Apology. P. S. Edit., p. 895.)

tine's words "not because the body of Christ is not received, which by St. Augustine's mind evil men do to their condemnation, but because the effect of life faileth," (in Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 26). But what has Cranmer to reply to this shift?

Truly he has a reply, which shivers not only Gardiner's evasion, but with it all the arguments by which the force of our Article is now sought to be evaded. Cranmer's words in reply are these—"Thus allege I St. Augustine truly, without adding anything of mine own head, or taking anything away. And what sleight I used is easy to judge: for I cite directly the places, that every man may see whether I say true or no. And if it be not true, quarrel not with me, but with St. Augustine, whose words I only rehearse. And that which St. Augustine saith, spake before him St. Cyprian, and Christ Himself also plainly enough; upon whose words I thought I might be as bold to build a true doctrine for the setting forth of God's glory, as you may be to pervert both the words of Cyprian, and of Christ Himself, to stablish a false doctrine to the high dishonour of God, and the corruption of His most true word. *For you add this word 'worthily,' whereby you gather such an unworthy meaning of St. Augustine's words as you list yourself. And the same you do to the very words of Christ Himself, who speaketh absolutely and plainly, without adding any such word as you put thereto.* What sophistry this is, you know well enough. Now if this be permitted unto you, to add what you list, and to expound how you list, then you may say what you list without controlment of any man, which it seemeth you look for." (On Lord's Supper, pp. 26, 27.)

But most noteworthy are the words of Cranmer, when again Gardiner would escape from the cogency of his arguments by the same sort of evasion. "Whereas," he says, "I have fully proved as well by authority of Scripture as by the testimony of many old writers, that although evil men eat the sacramental bread and drink the wine, which have the names of His flesh and blood, yet they eat not Christ's very flesh nor drink His blood; your short and whole answer is this, that evil men may be said *not to eat* Christ's flesh and drink His blood, because they do it *not fruitfully*, as they ought to do; 'and that *may be called* A NOT EATING, as they may be said not to hear God's word, that hear it not profitably; and a thing not well done, may be in speech called not done, in the respect of the good effect.' I grant such speeches be sometime used, but very rarely; and *when the VERY TRUTH cometh in discussion*, then

such PARADOXES ARE NOT TO BE USED. As if it came in question whether a house be builded, that is not well builded, then the definition of the matter must not be, that it is not builded, although the carpenters and other workmen have failed in their covenant and bargain, and not builded the house in such sort as they ought to have done. So our Saviour Christ teacheth that all heard the word, whether the seed fell in the highway, or upon the stones, or among the thorns, or in the good ground. Wherefore when this matter cometh in discussion among the old writers, whether evil men eat Christ's body or no, if the truth had been that evil men eat it, the old writers would not so precisely have defined the contrary, that they eat not, but would have said, they eat it, but not effectually, not fruitfully, not profitably. But now the authors which I have alleged, define plainly and absolutely, that evil men eat not Christ's body, without any other addition. But after this sort that you do use, it shall be an easy matter for every man to say what liketh him, and to defend it well enough, if he may add to the Scriptures and doctors' words at his pleasure, and make the sense after his own phantasy. The Scriptures and doctors which I allege do say in plain words, as I do say, that evil men do not eat the body of Christ, nor drink His blood, but only they that have life thereby. Now come you in with your addition and gloss, made of your own head, putting thereto this word 'effectually.' If I should say that Christ was never conceived nor born, could not I avoid all the Scriptures that you can bring to the contrary, by adding this word 'apparently,' and defend my saying stoutly? . . . And what heresy can be reformed, if the heretics may have that liberty that you do use, to add of their own heads to the words of Scripture? . . . Moreover, the authorities, which I have brought to approve my doctrine, do clearly cast away your addition, adding the cause why evil men cannot eat Christ's flesh nor drink His blood." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 215.)

Now, let us just look round, at the actual state and position of things—the Reformers well acquainted with just the same distinctions as those of the Ritualists—the Reformers rejecting them utterly, as advanced by Romish antagonists—the Reformers also maintaining as one man the doctrine which is contained in the words of the Article as naturally and obviously understood—the Reformers too quite capable of expressing themselves clearly in this matter, and language being very capable of being made to express the distinction maintained;

and let us ask, Is it likely, is it possible, that in framing this Article they have adopted a distinction they repudiated to make way for a doctrine they contended against most earnestly, and have expressed themselves in language most unlikely to convey the meaning they meant, when words were at hand which might readily have conveyed that meaning unmistakeably?

For what—we may ask, on such an extraordinary hypothesis as that of their wishing to say in this Article what Ritualists wish to make its true meaning—What was there to hinder their speaking out clearly? If they meant the word “partakers” to signify a beneficial or effectual reception, What hindered their inserting the word “*beneficially*” or “*effectually*”? What hindered their framing the remainder of the Article so as to express what they meant clearly, instead of hiding it under words, which could only naturally express what they did *not* mean? What conceivable purpose can they be supposed to have had for running such a risk of letting their true sense suffer shipwreck, when one word so easily might have been taken in to avoid it?

Nay, more. Our Reformers did not only *not* take in such a word, but there is evidence that they really did of set purpose omit such a word, for in the passage alluded to in St. Augustine, there was a word (“*spiritually*”) standing there (probably by interpolation, but *still standing*) and sometimes retained in the writings of Reformers when quoting the same passage. And this word might not only have suggested the insertion of some other such word, but if it had itself been retained it might possibly have helped somewhat to make some room for such an unnatural meaning as it contended for. But what did the compilers of our Articles do? Not only they failed to make any such insertion, but they so paraphrased the earlier words of St. Augustine’s sentence as to *exclude* that *very* interpolated word which might have seemed to modify his meaning.¹

Yet further. The Article has not only rejected the word “*spiritually*,” which might possibly have left room for a partaking *some other wise*; but it has adopted the word “*nowise*,” which can hardly be anything else than a closing the door (in the case of the faithless) against *oral reception* as well as *spiritual reception*, and a denial of partaking *unfruitful-wise* and *ineffectual-wise* quite as much as of partaking *fruitful-wise* and *effectual-wise*.

¹ See Appendix, Note B.

But we must add to this, that the subject of this Article was felt very much at the time of the Reformation, as it is felt now, to be a most important part of the controversy, and a test of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence.¹

The Question, "Do the wicked and faithless receive the body and blood of Christ?" separated Christians so called into two classes. On one side of that Question were Romanists and Lutherans, and they both answered "Yes." On the other side were those named "Reformed," and these answered "No." Archdeacon Denison was not the first to apply this unfailing test. Ask concerning the "Real Presence" and all might in one sense or other accept the term. Ask concerning the manner of the Reception, whether it be a heavenly and spiritual manner apprehended by faith; and the Reformed would very gladly and heartily say "Yes." But (however unnaturally) in some sense, Lutherans would say the same.² But ask concerning what unbelievers receive in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and then as now, it was felt that the question was a testing question, which must send you to one side or the other. And here we have an Article which deals with this very testing question. Every one would look to this Article for its "Yes" or its "No" to the question. Strange if its answer in natural language should be "No;" but when looked at through this strange theological language we should find it turned to "Yes"! Strange indeed, if on such a point theological language should be incapable of speaking expressly its "Yea," except through words which to common ears sound plain "Nay"!

And it may not be argued that the Article did not mean to have anything to do with this testing question, that it meant to leave it quite on one side, to let it rest an open question, not, in fact, to say anything to that subject at all. For even if the body of the Article could thus be explained, yet the heading of the Article must be allowed to indicate the subject of the Article, must be conceded to point to that which the Article is intended to speak to. And the heading of the Article sets forth the subject of the Article as this very testing subject. Nay more, much more, it tells not only the question it intends to answer, but it tells us the answer it means to give, for the heading is, "Of the wicked which eat not the body and blood of Christ."

¹ See Appendix, Note C.

² Yet with a denial of the "only" of our Article. See below, pp. 449, 485.

But it will be said, "The heading is no part of the Article, and in subscribing the Articles we are not required to subscribe to the headings. You have therefore no right to take the meaning out of the heading and impart that meaning into the Article."¹

Perhaps not. But I am sure I *have* a right, in all common sense, and in all common fairness, to use the sense of that heading, expressing as it does the known views of our Reformers on this testing question, declaring as it does the Article's intention, in accordance with the known views of our Reformers,—

¹ "They [our opponents] even go so far as to cast the words in our teeth and say that we could only sign the Article with a good conscience if the 'not' were omitted. TO THIS OF COURSE WE REPLY, that with the TITLE of the Article we have *nothing whatever to do*, we are called upon to SIGN the Article alone and NOT the TITLE with it. Of course, if the title be a true representation of the contents of the Article, then in signing the Article we do practically sign the title as well. But if the title contain something over and above what the Article itself declares, then it is *no concern of ours*: for otherwise we might be called upon practically to sign *seventy-eight Articles instead of thirty-nine*. The title therefore is neither *here nor there* in the matter, and must be left *entirely out of the question*." (Sequel to "Kiss of Peace," p. 412.) Subsequently the unnatural explanation of the Article is forced also into the title—"To 'partake of Christ' is not merely to receive Him, but *so* to receive Him as to become an actual sharer in His nature, by the assimilation of His substance into our own. In this sense therefore must the AMBIGUOUS PHRASE 'eat not' be taken in the title." (Sequel to "The Kiss of Peace," p. 413.)

To the same effect Dr. Pusey had written, "Nor can the heading of the Article stand *per se*, as a substantive proposition, apart and distinct from the meaning of the body of the Article. For this *would be* to make the *heading* of the Article, a 40th Article; which no one would allow to be right. Yet it is PROBABLE that the *heading* and the Article have *one and the same meaning*. Since then the meaning, attached by *some* to the heading, cannot be forced into the Article, it is obvious to think, whether the heading and the Article are not to be *brought into harmony*; by taking the *heading* in the only sense of which the Article admits." (Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 254.) So also Bishop Forbes, "Nor can the heading of an Article form a proposition, binding on us, distinct from the meaning of the body of the Article. For this would be to make such heading a 40th Article, which is, of course, inadmissible." (On Articles, vol. ii., p. 590.)

Concerning these quotations I desire to say nothing more than this—We must have a very poor opinion indeed of the framers of our Articles, if we conceive that the Titles, fairly understood, can be really capable of either adding to the meaning of the Articles, or misleading us as to their true sense. But if they are allowed not to be capable of misleading, their interpretative application, when it can be made available, *must* be a reasonable, right, and fair application.

In the case of the Article before us, Is there, I ask, any reasonable room for doubt as to the sense of the body of the Article itself? For myself, I can see none whatever. But of this, every fairly intelligent reader is quite as capable of judging, as the most learned theologian, unless it can be shown that the theology of the day had a language on the subject peculiar to itself. But, supposing that sufficient evidence had been brought forward to make the natural sense of the Article itself to be doubtful, could any one, in fairness, refuse to allow an appeal to the Title, for such help as it might afford towards a resolution of the doubt? I am well content to leave this question in the hands of my readers.

of repudiating any answer but one to that testing question,—I am sure (I say) I have a right to use the heading of this Article not to add to the Article's meaning, but to protect the only natural meaning of the Article from being taken from¹ it, to make room for another sense, which if it be allowed to come in, can only come in to crush what our Reformers set there as in a sure place, giving us the keys for its safe custody.

Let me further ask this question—Upon what conceivable hypothesis are we to account for the fact that this Article, having received the assent of Convocation in 1562, was not allowed to appear in the printed copies, if this Article was not understood to speak to this moot question, and to decide against the Corporal Presence? If, in the language of the time, it was naturally understood to deny only fruitful reception, the influence brought to bear against it appears unaccountable. What objection could any one have to accept and subscribe the Article in such a sense? On the other hand, understood in what I must call its natural sense, the omission was in entire accordance with the policy pursued in the earlier years of Elizabeth's reign. It would be offensive to many, and offensive in a particular, in which it was felt to be very inexpedient, at that time, to give needless offence. Its offence consisted in its applying so severe a test of doctrine, a test which was felt to exclude, of necessity, the doctrine of a Corporal Presence in the Elements.

Further yet, I must ask the reader, who desires to consider

¹ The words of the Articles were intended, I believe, to express the meaning of the heading, if possible, *more strongly and distinctly* rather than more equivocally. Take the following from Cranmer—"As for the ungodly and carnal, they may eat the bread and drink the wine, but with Christ Himself they have no communion or company; and therefore they neither eat His flesh, nor drink His blood." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 203.) Indeed it is not easy to see what language could have been used to speak more distinctly and decidedly than the Article does.

All who eat partake (see 1 Cor. x. 18 with 16,) though not all who partake eat. All eating is partaking. Not all partaking is eating. The words therefore "in no wise partakers" declare concerning the unfaithful eating of the *sign*, not only that it does not include the eating of the *thing signified*, but that it excludes any and every sort of real participation of Christ. The unfaithful can have NO SORT of *κοινωνία*, NO communion, NO partaking of Christ whatever. How then can they have the *κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*? How can they eat His flesh and drink His blood?

Compare the following from Ursinus—"Paulus dicit 1 Cor x. Nolim vos *participes* dæmoniorum esse: Non potestis *participes* esse mensæ Domini et mensæ dæmoniorum; poculum Domini bibere, et poculum dæmoniorum. Impii autem sunt *κοινωνοι* dæmoniorum, *participes* mensæ dæmoniorum, et bibentes poculum dæmoniorum. Ergo non sunt *κοινωνοι* Christi, neque *participes* mensæ et poculi Domini reipsa, utcumque *participes* sint symbolorum." (Common: Chytræi Consideratio, in Works, vol. ii., p. 1404. Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

fairly the claims of the new interpretation of this Article, to view it beside the following extract from "The Apology of the Church of England." "WE affirm, together with the ancient fathers, that the body of Christ is *not eaten* but of the good and faithful, and of those that are endued with the Spirit of Christ. THEIR doctrine is, that Christ's very body effectually [*re ipsa*—Latin] and, as they speak, *really* and *substantially*, may not only be eaten of the *wicked and unfaithful* men, but also (which is monstrous to be spoken) of mice and dogs."¹ (P. S. Edit., p. 92.) Now, will any² affirm that in this passage the "Apology" does not, on behalf of the Church of England, deny *simply* the reception of the *res sacramenti* by the unfaithful, and speak of the doctrine which affirms such a reception as one, by the Church of England repudiated?

And shall we then maintain that the Church of England uses one sort of theological language in her "Apology," and (at the same date) quite a different theological language in her Articles?

But we must not only do this, we must also make the Church of England teach *one doctrine* in her Apology, and, at the same time, the very *opposite doctrine* in her Articles—if we will maintain that the Article before us does not actually deny all real [*re ipsa*] reception of Christ's body by the unfaithful.

If anything needs to be added, let it be added to all this, that at the date of the framing and first subscribing of this Article, there had been not eight years before, one of our English martyrs, and one not the least honoured, who had been condemned to the stake on the very charge of asserting what this Article in its natural and obvious meaning asserts; and that the very words of Bradford as quoted in his sentence of condemnation correspond almost exactly with the words which stand in the title of this Article. The title of our Article is³ "Of the wicked which eat not the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper." Bradford's sentence⁴ is the sentence of death because—in the

¹ The Latin is as follows: "Nos cum antiquissimis Patribus affirmamus, corpus Christi *non comedi nisi ab hominibus piis et fidelibus, et imbutis Spiritu Christi*: isti docent ipsissimum corpus Christi *re ipsa*, utque ipsi loquuntur, 'realiter,' et 'substantialiter,' non tantum ab impiis et infidelibus, sed etiam, quod horrendum dictu est, a muribus et canibus posse comedi." (Edit. Cantab., 1838, p. 106.)

² Against any such affirmation, there is surely no need to appeal to the support of the "Defence of the Apology," which would remove all doubt, if doubt were possible.

³ Originally the Title stood "Impii non manducant corpus Christi in usu cœnæ." The change in the form of the Titles was made at Jewel's last revision in 1571.

⁴ The entire accusation may be seen quoted in Paper No. 2.

words of that sentence—he said “that an evil man doth not receive it [the body of Christ] *in forma panis*.” (See Bradford’s Works, ii., p. 585.)

And Bradford declares to Pendleton, “Transubstantiation is the thing whereof I am condemned, and also the denial of wicked men to receive Christ’s body.” (See Ibid. p. 542.)

And if it be contended that there may be a difference meant between *receiving* Christ’s body and *eating* Christ’s body or being *partaker* of Christ’s body, then let us observe that Bradford again in his farewell to Walden, declares that he is persecuted because, he says, “I cannot, dare not, nor will not confess transubstantiation: and how that wicked men . . . *eating* the sacrament . . . do *eat* Christ’s natural and real body.” (Ibid. p. 456.)

Is there anything, then, it may be asked, lacking to bring out the identity of language?

And shall we suppose that eight years sufficed to make such a wonderful change in the theological language of the time? or shall we think that the history of Bradford had passed all out of mind?

Or shall we think that Bradford’s memory abiding, and language remaining unchanged, the framers of our Articles while desiring to express a totally different thing, were unable to find any language to express their meaning, but that which naturally expressed the very thing for which they knew Bradford had been put to death?

Is it conceivable that they chose to use language which naturally understood would place them as on Bradford’s side, while, in truth, they were only meaning to express a doctrine which would rather set them on the side of Bradford’s condemners?¹

Yet to estimate the weight of this evidence at anything like

¹ “What a new wonder must this be to the world, to hear the Church constituted by Cranmer and Ridley accused of popery! the faith and worship suspected to be unreformed, which was delivered down to us by those great martyrs! Is this the reward of a Church whose sons have given so loud a testimony against the Roman, in their lives and by their deaths; who have still borne the burden and heat of day, who have felt the fiercest rage of the enemy, and have returned them the deadliest wounds; who have been foremost still in all encounters, all along in the last age and in our own, the famous and victorious champions of the Protestant cause? If this Church, and these men, after the declaration made in our Articles, after repeated subscriptions and abrenunciations, after all this zealous opposition of popery, must be yet suspected of popery; as well, on the other side, may the decrees of the Council of Trent be said to comply with the Reformation, and the Pope himself be thought a Protestant.” (Bishop George Hooper of Bath and Wells. Works, vol. i., p. 3. Edit. Oxford, 1855.)

its true value, Bradford's case must not be regarded as standing in an isolated position. No. But it must be viewed in connexion with a fact, a fact of which every attentive reader will have found evidence in the second and third Papers of this series. I mean the fact, that what Bradford denied, and was burnt for denying (the reception of Christ by the wicked), our Reformers were constantly denying, and denying in the same words in which Bradford denied it. Or to say the same thing in other words, our Reformers were continually teaching and asserting just that which, in its natural meaning, the 29th Article teaches and asserts (that the wicked do in no wise receive Christ), and asserting and teaching it in just the same sort of language as that in which our Article asserts it and teaches it still.

And did the Framers of the Article, being our Reformers themselves, aim at teaching something in the Article quite different from that which our Reformers always taught; and did they think to teach that other and quite different, yea rather that *repugnant* doctrine, in language which *out of the Article* our Reformers always used to signify that which they *did* believe and *did* always teach, viz., that (in the natural and obvious meaning of the words) the wicked do not eat the body of Christ?

For one very plain example of the use of such language, and of the sense in which it was used, let the reader refer to Rogers's "Exposition of the Articles," published in 1585. It will be found to give most important evidence on this point. Rogers speaks of the Ubiquitaries, "which think the body of Christ so is present in the Supper, as His said body, with bread and wine, by one and the same mouth, at one and the same time, of all and every communicant is *eaten* corporally and *received* into the belly." (Page 289.) And again he speaks of "the Ubiquitaries, both Lutheran and Popish," as "Adversaries to this doctrine" because of their "saying the very body of Christ, at the Lord's Supper, is eaten as well of the wicked as of the godly; these affirming that all communicants, bad and good, do eat the very and natural body of Christ Jesus." (Page 293.)¹

¹ The work of Rogers "perused, and by the lawful authority of the Church of England, allowed to be public," has on its title-page (1607) the words "The said Articles analysed into propositions, and the Propositions proved to be agreeable both to the written word of God, and to the *extant Confessions* of all the neighbour Churches, Christianly REFORMED."

And of this 29th Article it declares (p. 293) "Of this judgement be other Churches, Christian and reformed besides"; giving references to Confess. Helv.,

Here is unquestionable evidence given as to the theological language of the time, (1) that the words *eat* and *receive* are used convertibly, (2) that *eat* is not used for profitable eating or receiving, (3) that this Article itself was so understood at this date (fourteen years after its authorization) as that all Ubiquitaries, Lutheran as well as Romanists, were regarded (to use Rogers's own words) as "Adversaries unto this doctrine," *i.e.* to the doctrine declared and stated in this very 29th Article, (4) of the testing character of the question of eating and receiving, as then understood.

It will tend further to illustrate the teaching of our Article from the theological language of the period, to refer briefly to the published account of the Conference with Campion the Jesuit, Sept. 23, 1581. The following is an extract. "*Fulke*. . . . Answer to Saint Augustine, which saith, The wicked eat not the body of Christ in very deed. *Campion*. They eat Christ sacramentally. *Fulke*. Yea, but not in deed, as Saint Augustine saith. *Campion*. They receive the same Christ, but not to the same comfort, that the godly do. *Fulke*. They do not receive Christ, saith Saint Augustine: because they are not to be accounted in the members of Christ. *Campion*. And I say the same. *Fulke*. HE SAITH, THEY EAT NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN DEED: YOU AFFIRM THAT THEY EAT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN DEED. . . . *Goade*. I will follow the confutation of that absurd assertion, that the wicked eat the body of Christ, which is easy to be improved many ways. I will frame mine argument thus, Whosoever eateth the body of Christ, doth eat *Rem Sacramenti*, the thing or substance of the Sacrament. But no wicked person can eat *Rem Sacramenti*. *Ergo*, No wicked person can eat the body of Christ. . . . *Goade*. It is manifest, that Saint Augustine doth make but two parts of the Sacrament, which he doth distinguish, *viz.*, the outward sign which he calleth the Sacrament, and the inward thing or substance of the Sacrament, which is Christ Himself. And

Basil., Bohem., Gal., Belg.; from which the following extracts are given (see note in P. S. Edit.) "Qui nullâ cum fide ad hanc sacram Domini mensam accedit, sacramento duntaxat communicat, et rem sacramenti, unde est vita et salus, non percipit." (Conf. Helv. Post. cap. xxi.) "It is *spiritual* meat, and therefore it is received of a *faithful* soul." (Conf. Basil, in Hall's Harmony, p. 325.)

"Affirmamus eos, qui ad mensam Domini, *puram fidem*, tanquam *vas quoddam afferunt*, vere recipere quod ibi signa testificantur." (Conf. Gall., Art. 37.) "Præterea quamvis sacramenta sint conjuncta rei ipsæ significatæ, ambæ tamen res istæ non ab omnibus recipiuntur. Malus enim recipit quidem sacramentum in suam condemnationem, at rem seu veritatem sacramenti non recipit." (Conf. Belg., Art. 35.)

out of the same words of Augustine, I follow mine argument thus against your absurd distinction. Whosoever eateth Christ the thing or substance of the Sacrament, shall live for ever. But none of the wicked or unfaithful shall live for ever. *Ergo*, None of the wicked can eat Christ, being the substance of the Sacrament. . . . *Goade*. . . . Consider the words of Augustine, he affirmeth the Sacrament to consist of two things, the visible *sign*, which he calleth *Hujus rei Sacramentum*, and the invisible grace, or Christ Himself, which he calleth *Rem Sacramenti*." (Third Day's Conference, Arg. 9 and 10.)

Now let the reader be asked to mark here (1) the use of language corresponding to that of our Article (*eating and receiving* being used indiscriminately) to teach a doctrine diametrically opposed to that of the Ritualists, but just that which agrees with the natural and obvious interpretation of the Article, (2) the appeal—after the manner of the Article—to the teaching of Augustine as clearly supporting this natural sense, (3) the sense attached to "*sign* or *sacrament*," and regarded as the sense of St. Augustine, which is clearly the sense required for the obvious and natural interpretation of the Article, but which will not agree at all with the sense of the Ritualists. Let the reader also observe that the publication from which this extract is made has the authority of Dean Nowell, the author, probably, of our Church Catechism, and certainly of that larger Catechism, which has received the sanction, if not in full of the Convocation of 1562, yet certainly of the Convocation of 1603 in the 79th Canon.

I trust the reader will not think me wearisome, if I adduce yet another example, giving evidence, both as to the theological language of the period, and also as to the fact of our Article dealing with one of the chief moot-questions of the Reformation.

I refer to the dying testimony of Dr. Redmayne, a man whom Strype speaks of as a "Papist,"¹ and "one of the learnedest men of his time," "a Person of extraordinary reputation among all for his great Learning and Reading, and profound knowledge

¹Strype has been found fault with for using this term. But it is evidently (I think) intended simply to convey the impression that Redmayne had never given in his adherence to the new learning. Standing aloof from the decided action of our Reformers, and pursuing independently his own investigations, his mind (which, so far as it was prejudiced, would have been led by its prejudices in the opposite direction) had been brought, it appears, before his decease, to nearly the same conclusions as those of our Reformers, in *most* (though scarcely yet fully in *all*) the points in dispute.

of Divinity, so that the greatest Divines gave a mighty deference to his judgment." Mr. Soames says that "Dr. Redmayne had been engaged during more than twenty years in theological research. His original object in undertaking these laborious enquiries was to confirm himself and others in the religious principles long implicitly admitted by European scholars." But "the result was that he found himself obliged to admit the truth of nearly all the principles which he had reckoned on proving false." He was overtaken by mortal illness in 1551.¹ "While lingering at ease in mind, and unclouded in apprehension, Bishop Ridley and others who knew his worth, resorted to the dying scholar's couch." Strype says, "Many learned men resorted to him, desiring to know his last judgment on several points, then so much controverted." To Dr. Alexander Nowell, then master of Westminster school, the dying man gave a somewhat detailed account of the theological opinions, to which his long and learned investigations had led him. We must not enter into these except so far as his words bear upon the question before us. But very important is the following declaration made by this dying man, "Item, That the wicked are *not partakers* of the body of Christ, but receive the *outward sacrament only*." ²

Can any one read this and doubt what here is meant by the word "*partakers*"? Can any one doubt what Dr. Redmayne meant by *the outward sacrament only* received by the wicked? ³

¹ It may be observed that the words of Redmayne bear witness to the sense of the theological language of our Article about eleven years before its composition; as that of Rogers does about fourteen years after its authorization.

² See Foxe's Acts and Monuments (Seeley's Edit.), vol. vi., p. 269; Strype's Cranmer, book ii., chap. xxvi., pp. 269, 270; Soames's History of Reformation, vol. iii., pp. 633-638; Hardwick's Reformation, p. 225; Downes's Life of Redmayne, prefixed to Sparrow's Rationale. Edit. 1722, pp. 144, 145.

³ If it were possible to doubt, no doubt would remain after reading the following extract from Young's letter: "When he was asked, whether wicked and ungodly people, in the Holy Communion, did *eat* the body of Christ, and drink His blood, he answered, that kind of men *did NOT eat* Christ's most blessed flesh, but *ONLY TOOK* the sacrament to their own damnation; saying, that Christ would not give His most pure and holy flesh to be eaten of such naughty and impure persons, but would withdraw Himself from them. 'And that,' quoth he, 'that is objected by St. Augustine, that Judas received the self same thing which Peter received, that I think to be understood of the *external sacrament*.'" (See Foxe's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi., p. 272.) Again he said that the wicked "do receive the *sacrament*, and the self same which good and godly men *receive*; but the body of Christ they *do NOT receive*, for Christ doth not vouchsafe to deliver it them." (Ibid. pp. 272, 273.)

Let it be specially observed that Dr. Redmayne uses the three expressions (1) to *eat*, (2) to *receive*, (3) to *be partakers of*, all to signify the same thing.

It will be observed that Dr. Redmayne's words are cited here for their bearing on

And shall we think that our Article is using language in quite a different sense, and meaning to affirm quite a different thing, when it asserts that the wicked "in no wise are partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing"?

Yet, just once more, let it be added that in King Edward's reign, Peter Martyr had publicly taught at Oxford (where his lectures as Regius Professor had been so highly valued by many of our Reformers), and that with special reference to the Lutheran doctrine—"Quicquid impii ibi comedant corporaliter, non debent dici comedere Corpus Christi, nisi signo aut symbolo velis tribuere nomen rei."¹

Will any one maintain that Peter Martyr was not in these words denying all real reception by the wicked? Will any one look at our Article as set beside the words of Peter Martyr, and maintain that it is dealing with an altogether different question, and teaching an altogether different doctrine?

But enough of this, I proceed to reply to—

II. The second allegation, viz., that this non-natural sense of the Article is supported by the known opinions (1) of Archbishop Parker, (2) of Bishops Cheney and Geste, and (3) of St. Augustine.

(1) Archbishop Parker is rightly claimed as the writer of this Article. And though the true meaning of the Article is the sense in which it was authorized, which might possibly not be the meaning of the framer; yet let it freely be granted, that the force of our arguments in favour of the natural and obvious meaning of the Article, will be broken up, if it can be shown that Parker's opinions were certainly or even probably the

the question of *language*. He made statements clearly (I think) condemnatory of anything like the Real Objective Presence. His mind, however, seems to have been not fully settled in—though certainly inclined to—the persuasion, that reception is after a *spiritual manner* ONLY. (See Foxe, p. 268. But see also pp. 267, 270, 273.)

T. Lever, who received his information from Young himself, says that Dr. Redmayne "added, moreover, that it was an excellent book which the most reverend Archbishop of Canterbury had lately written upon the Eucharist, and he recommended Young to read it with much attention." (See Orig. Letters, P. S. Edit., i., p. 152.)

¹ See *Loci Communes*, vol. i., p. 1626 b, Basle, 1580. Compare the following: "Impii accedentes, panem quidem et vinum sumunt, nihil autem fructus habent, sed ad exitium manducant et bibunt: pii vero ac fideles, non simplicia et nuda signa usurpant, sed una corporis et sanguinis Christi credendo fiunt participes." (Peter Martyr, *Loci Communes*, vol. i., p. 734 b. Basle, 1580.)

opinions on this subject of those who hold the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence.

Certainly, till this is shown, what has been stated presents a most weighty presumption against Parker's holding such views. But if it can be shown indeed, that, in spite of all the presumption against it, Parker *did* hold them, then it must be confessed our arguments will be pretty much brought to nought.

But did Parker hold these views? Trace this opinion concerning Parker to its source, and it will be found—that like many a large river rising from a small fountain—it has its original (I think) in nothing more than the ill-name of “a great Papist”¹ which some Puritan zealots desired to fasten upon him. But then Whitgift too was called by harder names still, and Whitgift, as we have seen, in terms renounced “the Real Presence.” Nay more; we have seen that Parker too by his approval of Whitgift's book and his own declaration of the oneness of our Church's doctrine stands committed also to a denial of “the Real Presence” on behalf of the English Church.

And it is not difficult to account for Parker's being called a great Papist² without his being a Lutheran. Nay: a strong argument might be built on this name against it. For he was called so, because, in his zeal for conformity, he was strong in insisting on the vestments (*i.e.* the surplice, tippet, etc.), and the vestments³ by the Puritans were counted “Papistical.”

¹ For *what* this name was given to Parker may appear from his words following. “Does your Lordship thinke, that I care either for cap, tippet, surplis, or wafer-bread, or any such? But for the lawes so established, I esteeme them, and not more for exercise of contempt against lawe and authoritie, which I se wil be the end of it: nor for any other respect. If I, you, or any other, named great Papistes, should so favour the Pope, or his religion, that we should pinch Christ's true Gospel, woe be unto us all.” These words are from Parker's last letter to the Lord Treasurer, quoted from Strype by Soames (*Elizabethan History*, p. 19), who says, “For enforcing these ancient formalities, he, and others in authority, had been stigmatised as *Great Papists*. He repels the appellation as calumnious, admitting an awful responsibility were it otherwise.”

Whitgift also with all his distinctness against “the Real Presence” was called by Barrow “a monster, a persecutor, a compound of he knew not what, neither ecclesiastical nor civil, like the second beast spoken of in the Revelations.” (See Neal's “*History of Puritans*,” i., p. 354.)

² Neal writes deliberately of Queen Elizabeth as “*more inclined to*” *Popery* than Puritanism, while in the very same sentence declaring that “she *approved* of the DOCTRINES of the *foreign reformed* Churches, but thought they had stripped religion too much of its *ornaments*.” (“*History of Puritans*,” vol. i., p. 383.)

³ The reader must not fail to observe that there is a very wide difference indeed between the “*vestments*” which were in controversy in Elizabeth's reign, and the “*vestments*” which are in controversy now. Bullinger's opinion of the one and the other may be seen in the words following: “And to repeat my sentiments in a few words, I could never approve of your officiating, if so commanded, at an altar laden rather than adorned with the image of Him that was crucified, and in the

And it shows how ready the Puritans were to find matter for strong language, and to bring accusations for trifles. Should

appropriate dress of the mass, that is in the albe and cope, on the back part of which also the same image is represented. But as far as I can understand by a letter from England there is no dispute concerning the habits of this kind, but the question is whether it be lawful for the ministers of the Gospel to wear a round or square cap, and a white garment which they call a surplice, by the wearing of which the minister may be distinguished from the people." (Bullinger quoted in Blakeney's Book of Common Prayer, pp. 299, 300.)

"Mr. Marriott gives in illustration a number of drawings and photographs from the Early Christian cemeteries. The briefest glance at them will convince the reader of two things; first, that anything like the present vestments of the Romish celebrant were absolutely unknown for four or five centuries at least; and secondly, that the actual vestments of that period more resembled the flowing surplice and stole of an English clergyman than anything else. . . . It is no less clear from the remarks respecting the use of colour we find in the earliest Fathers, notably in Clemens Alexandrinus, that they would have regarded the use of bright colours as most unsuitable because meretricious. The copies of wall paintings in the ancient catacombs appear to place it beyond the reach of doubt that the vestments in which the earliest Christians ministered were white." (Saddler in the Church and the Age, p. 311.) For further evidence as to white vestments, see L'Aroque, History of Eucharist, p. 539, Walker's translation, 1684. See also Hooker, vol. ii., p. 130. Edit. Keble.

"We have the fullest evidence that vestments of brilliant colours were regarded by Christians [in the earlier ages] as heathenish, unmanly and meretricious, fit only for the stage, or for the rites of Pagan superstition, in which they were worn by the sacrificing priests. On the other hand, white raiment satisfied all their wants of appropriate symbolism, and appeared to them most truly beautiful. The thing which would probably have amazed them most of all would have been to hear that the ornaments which in their minds were associated with all that was most profane, effeminate and impure, were the best fitted for the celebration of their holiest mysteries. . . . We may also infer with great confidence from all we know, that the need or propriety of a peculiar vestment for solemnizing the Lord's Supper—which is now insisted on almost as an axiom—never entered the minds of those early Christians; though, if it had, the vestments adopted by the Ritualists after the Romish fashion, are the last they would have chosen for the purpose." (Bishop of St. David's Charge, 1869, pp. 52, 53. See Bellarmine, De Missâ, lib. ii., cap. xiv., pp. 1097, 1098. See also S. C. Malan on Ritualism, pp. 28-32, 112.)

In our second Book of Homilies it is said, "You see how St. Jerome teacheth the sumptuousness of the Jews to be a figure to signify, and not an example to follow, and that those outward things were suffered for a time until Christ our Lord came." (Page 229. Third part of Sermon against Peril of Idolatry.) And this follows a quotation from St. Jerome, in which it is said, "Neither let any man object and allege against me the rich temple that was in Jewry, the table, candlesticks, incense, ships, platters, cups, mortars, and other things all of gold. Then were these things allowed of the Lord, when the priests offered sacrifices, and the blood of beasts was accounted the redemption of sins." Again the Homily says (pp. 230, 231) "Zephyrinus, the sixteenth bishop of Rome, made a decree, that they should use vessels of glass. Likewise were the vestures used in the Church in old time very plain and single, and nothing costly. And Rabanus at large declareth, that this costly and manifold furniture of vestments of late used in the Church was fetched from the Jewish usage, and agreeth with Aaron's apparelling almost altogether." (See on this subject a Pamphlet—"The Rubric as to the Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof." Parker, Oxford.)

"Olim sacrificium ab Apostolis et viris apostolicis in primitiva Ecclesia vasis ligneis, et vulgaribus vestibus celebrabatur." (Beleth in Durandus, Rational. Div. Offic., p. 778 a. Naples, 1859.)

we not then certainly have heard of it, if they could have laid to Parker's charge any such false doctrine? Yet what Puritan ever charged him with teaching the Corporal Presence?

It might¹ be curious to trace the steps by which this doctrine has been brought and laid at Parker's door. The "*Papistical*" name seems to have suggested an identification with those included in the phrase² "*Lutherano-Papistical Ministry*" used by Grindal and Horne in writing to Bullinger. And this perhaps may have led to his being classed together with Cheney and Geste; and this again possibly to his being set down as one known to incline to the Lutherans. Now all this building—built (as it would seem) upon one hard name—we must even

¹The Romanist Dorman classes together Parker, Geste, and Cheney as men worthy to bear the office of true bishops in Christ's Church, and speaks of Parker as a Lutheran in respect to the Eucharist. Dorman is quoted apparently with approval by Hardwick (*History of the Reformation*, p. 246), who also himself speaks of Geste as a scholar "of like mind" with Parker; though, it should be added, that in his work on the Articles (p. 138) he speaks of Dorman's statements as probably exaggerated. This appears to have led Dr. Pusey into the error of classing Parker with Geste and Cheney, which Dean Goode declares to be "an assertion without the slightest foundation . . . a mere polemical device, for which there is not the slightest ground." (On Eucharist, *Supplement*, p. 26.) Dr. Pusey's words are, "We know that there were then, as now, two parties in the Church, of the one of which Archbishop Parker himself, Bishop Geste, and Bishop Cheney were representatives . . . of those two parties, Archbishop Parker, who wrote with his own hand the most important changes in the Articles of the Sacrament, belonged to that, which, from its belief as to the Sacraments, was called Lutheran." (Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church, pp. 186-7.) Perhaps led by Dr. Pusey's error we find Mr. Grueber asserting that "it is well known Parker was very favourable" to the Lutherans. (Reply to Dr. Heurtley, p. 42, note.) It is to the credit of Lingard, that he does not, I think, make any attempt to convey this misconception.

It is fair, too, to Mr. Perry to observe, that he only claims for Parker that "his views on this Doctrinal question" were certainly "*not lower* than Grindal's." (On Declaration concerning Kneeling, p. 68.) I should be sorry not to concede even more than this very willingly.

²Heylin speaks of "the whole number" of those clergy who did not conform on Elizabeth's accession as "not amounting to 200 men, which in a realm consisting of 9,000 parishes, and twenty-six Cathedral Churches, could be no great matter." "But then," he adds, "we are to know withal that many who were cordially affected to the interests of the Church of Rome dispensed with themselves in these outward conformities, which some of them are said to do upon a hope of seeing the like revolution by the death of the Queen as had before happened by the death of King Edward." (*History of Reformation*. E. H. S. Edit., vol. ii., pp. 295, 296.) After reading this none will think it needful to apply the term "*Lutherano-papistical ministry*" to such as Archbishop Parker. The letter of Grindal and Horne will be found in Zurich Letters, i., pp. 175-181. In it they give it as a reason for conformity to the habits, that otherwise "verily we should have a papistical, or at least a Lutheran-papistical ministry, or none at all." (Page 177.) See Soames's *History of Reformation*, vol. iv., p. 666; and Strype's *Annals*, vol. i., p. 178, Edit. 1725; and Hallam's *Constitutional History*, vol. i., p. 120, Edit. 1867.

pull down and lay low : and acknowledging,¹ indeed, what some contend for, that the tendency of Parker's mind and principles was to be conservative, we must contend that it was conservative above all of the great principles of the Reformation,² conservative, therefore, of the truth that the wicked eat not the

¹ It must not be supposed that I am questioning at all the fact that the tendency of Parker's mind really was strongly and wisely conservative. Soames says of him, "Archbishop Parker was, probably, far less fond of such imposing externals than his royal mistress, though he hesitated at first, as to the expediency of retaining crosses. Having, indeed, concealed himself at home during the Marian persecution, he had never seen Protestantism under any other form than that which it wore in Edward's reign. He had, accordingly, no thought of reconstructing a Church upon some alleged reference to Scripture merely—a principle hitherto unacknowledged by his countrymen. He was imbued with a deep veneration for antiquity, and had no further wish than to free the religious system immemorably established from blemishes detected by recent inquirers of undeniable competence. For this end he laboured with a patient industry, and a solidity of judgment, which have rendered most important services to the Reformation. The deliberate convictions of such a man could not fail of having great weight in the country, and they were justly entitled to it." (Soames's Elizabethan History, p. 15.)

"Parker had all the value for law and decency which experience imprints upon grave, wise, and elderly minds." (Ibid. p. 19.)

Dr. Lamb says, "He had an attachment, bordering upon veneration, for ancient religious foundations." (Historical Account of 39 Art., Preface, p. 1.) He was apparently thought somewhat suspicious of the "Germanical natures" of some of the returned exiles. (See Sandys's Letter in Parker's Correspondence, p. 125.) He was also an admirer of "reverent mediocrity" of the Church of England. (See Correspondence, pp. 215 and 173.) But in Parker's "mediocrity" there was no want of fixedness of principle, no doctrinal concession of the truth which had been by the Reformation won back for the Church of England. (See especially his letter to Heath and the other deprived Bishops, in Correspondence, pp. 109-113.)

Cranmer too was not without some such conservative tendency ; evidence of which may be seen in his letter of Oct. 7, 1552, given in J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, Historical Introduction, pp. xxxi., xxxii. (The entire letter may also be seen in Perry on Declaration concerning Kneeling, pp. 77-79.)

² How determinately Parker stood on the principles of the Reformation, and how boldly he put himself forward to defend them, may be seen in the following extract from Strype (Parker, Book ii., chap. 8, p. 109)—"There was one Passage in the Queen's angry speech to the Archbishop, which as it startled him more than all the rest, so I cannot omit the mention of it. Which was, that she told him, she had other manner of Injunctions, which should follow ; as tho' she had thoughts of setting out Injunctions in favour of Popery. For so the Archbishop seemed to understand her words, when reflecting upon them, he told the Secretary very seriously, 'That there would not be wanting of that Contemtable Flock, that would not shrink to offer their blood for the defence of Christ's Verity. And that he would be sorry, that the clergy should have cause to show their disobedience to her, and be forced to use the words of the Apostle, "we must obey God rather than men." . . . He trusted, that as she had begun godly in this good work [of Reforming Religion] so God would stay her heart, and move her to go on and to finish.'" (See Neal's History of Puritans, vol. i., pp. 118-9. Note.) Parker held the opinion of our Reformers (including Ridley,—see Works, p. 414, sqq.) that the Church of Rome is Babylon. He wrote, "It is the pride, covetousness, and usurpation of the Bishop of Rome, and of his predecessors, which hath made the Princes of the Earth to defend their territories and their privileges from that wicked Babylon and her Bishop." (Correspondence, p. 109.)

body of Christ, and therefore, with all its conservancy, destructive—utterly destructive—of the Real Objective Presence.

In support of this position we call back to witness (1) the heading of this Article (leaving the Article out of the question): for, whatever may be said of its relation to the Article, there can be nothing alleged against its evidence of Parker's own views. And if Parker had left us a treatise on this subject, and these words of his had come in the treatise, who would have hesitated to pronounce them decisive? Not, I feel sure, anyone acquainted with the language of our Reformers. Why should they be less decisive now that they stand as a title to an Article of Religion? (2) We call back to witness Parker's sanction of Whitgift's assertion¹—of a piece with the teaching of his Book—that this Church hath rejected "the Real Presence." (3) We call back to witness the fact of Parker's careful review² and sanction of the "*Reformatio Legum*" with all its very exceedingly distinct and unequivocal utterances on this subject.³ (4) We call back to witness the fact of Parker's approval, and more than approval, of Jewel's⁴ Apology, with all its emphatic opposition to the doctrine before us. (5) We call for witness the high value and esteem which Parker had for

¹ See above, pp. 12, 13, 18, 19, 20.

² See above on the "*Reformatio Legum*" in No. 4, p. 112, sqq. Strype says "He was the setter forth, I make little doubt, of the '*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*.' . . . Cranmer's own copy (with writings of P. Martyr who assisted) fell into Archbishop Parker's hands, and he reduced the titles into order, and had it fair written for the press—having then the assistance of J. Foxe." (Strype's Parker, book iv., chap. xlv., p. 455.)

³ See Paper No. 4, (especially p. 114) and Neal's History of Puritans, i., p. 43. That Parker should have reviewed the "*Reformatio Legum*" without expunging, or even altering—so as to modify the strength of—these *very* decided utterances, is surely quite unaccountable, if he really had anything like a leaning towards the Lutheran doctrine of the Presence in the Eucharist.

⁴ See Parker's Letter to Lady Bacon prefixed to her English translation of the Apology. (P. S. Edit., p. 51.) Herein the Archbishop says, "I am . . . enforced, not only to shew my rejoice of this your doing, but also to testify the same by this my writing prefixed before the work. . . . You have used your accustomed modesty in submitting it to judgment. . . . And, whereas *the chief Author of the Latin work and I, severally perusing and conferring your whole translation, have without alteration allowed of it. . . . And now to the end both to acknowledge my good approbation, and to spread the benefit more largely, where your ladyship hath sent me your book written, I have with most hearty thanks returned it to you (as you see) printed.*"

Strype says that he gives this letter "Chiefly to reconcile a due value unto this piece, written on behalf of our Reformed Church; being thus *publicly owned and favoured* by the Chief Bishop of it in his time. The Epistle is printed before the edition of the book. And to make this treatise of the Church of England the more perfect, there is added at the end of it a small tract, entitled '*The manner how the Church of England is administered and governed,*' which, I make no doubt, is the work of the Archbishop's own pen." (Strype's Parker, book ii., chap. xxv., p. 179.)

Bullinger,¹ whose very name was bound up with the doctrines of the Reformed.² (6) We call for witness Parker's high value of Archbishop Cranmer, whom some now regard as a Zuinglian heretic, but of whose MSS. Parker spoke as "the great notable written books of my predecessor Dr. Cranmer," adding "I would as much rejoice³ while I am in the country to win them, as I would to restore an old chancel to reparation." (Correspondence, p. 186.)

And let it be remembered that among the treasured writings of Cranmer (and we know that he valued especially Cranmer's writings on⁴ the Eucharist) Parker would find the repudiation *passim* of the doctrine which the Ritualists would put in the Article, and not only so, but the indignant repudiation also of the very distinction by which they desire to effect this.

(7) We call for witness his dealing with Geste and Cheney, of whom we shall have more to say presently. Here it must suffice to state, that instead of its being true that Parker was

¹ "The Archbishop did join with the rest of his brethren the Bishops, in giving *all deference* to Henry Bullinger, Chief Pastor of the Church of Zurich; who had shewn great tenderness and regard to many learned exiles there under Queen Mary's reign: and who rejoiced at the Reformation in England." (Strype's Parker, book iv., chap. vi., p. 331.)

"I will not forget to write to M. Bullinger." (Jewel's Letter to Parker, Jan. 31, 1568, in Jewel's Works. P. S. Edit., iv., p. 1274.)

² See above, in Paper No. 4. Bellarmine says—"Zwinglium et Ecolampadium sequuti sunt permulti eorum discipuli, ac præcipuè Henricus Bullingerus Zwinglii successor, in sede Tigurina, qui scripsit Apologiam pro Zwinglio contra Lutheranos." (De Eucharistia, lib. i., cap. 1, p. 467 b.)

³ "It was this year (1563) that Archbishop Parker recovered Cranmer's (his predecessor's) manuscripts. They were in the hands of Dr. Nevinson, prebendary of Canterbury. Nevinson denying their being in his custody, the Archbishop procured a letter from the Privy Council to search Nevinson's study, where they were found. They are two volumes in folio, collected from the Scriptures, Fathers, councils, and schoolmen, and digested into common places. The design of them was to justify the English Reformation, and show how far the modern Church of Rome had deserted the primitive doctrine, and gone off from the plan of antiquity. These volumes were transcribed by Parker, and they are now lodged in the library of the lord bishop of London." (Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. vi., pp. 394-5. See Strype's Parker, book ii., chap. 15.)

⁴ The following extract from his work "*De antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*" ought *alone* (I think) to suffice for the removal of all question as to Parker's Eucharistic views—"Cranmerus domi otium omne suum sacris literis impertivit; scripsitque contra pontificiorum sententiam illam crassam atque carnalem in sanctæ Cœnæ sacramento Christi præsentiam affirmantium, tanta doctrina et argumentorum copia refertum librum; ut ea controversia a nemine unquam contra pontificios accuratius tractata esse videatur." (Quoted in Preface to Jenkyns's Edition of Cranmer's Works, pp. xcix. and c.)

[Whatever doubts may exist as to Parker's sole *authorship* of the entire work from which this extract is taken, there can be no question as to Parker's regarding himself as *responsible* for the contents of what he calls "My book of Canterbury Predecessors."]]

sailing in the same boat with them, Geste evidently felt sorely the weight of Parker's opposition. And Cheney¹ was once

¹ Parker's opinion of Cheney and his peculiar "contemplations" may appear somewhat from his writing to Cecil as follows, Aug., 1568—"I would be loth it [the bishoprick of Chichester] should fall upon one such body as, I am informed by his friends, make suit for it. We of this order learn by experience what rule Gloucester maketh in his people. He is so old that he would bring his people to his contemplations, which he laboureth to do, but spyeth that he shall never, and thereupon wisheth he were discharged, which he hath pretended a long time. But he meaneth another thing." (Parker's Correspondence. P. S. Edit., p. 332. See also p. 138.)

"Two Letters of D. Cheney, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, dat. Oct. 7 and 13, 1568, to Mr. Secretary Cecil, to prevent the ill impressions that might be made by a public complaint design'd agst his Sermons lately preach't in Bristol, and vindicating the Doctrines in them relating to free will and Real Presence." (Lansdowne MSS. No. 981; Bishop Kennett's Collection, vol. xlvii.)

An account of his preaching at Bristol, and the complaints made against him, and his defence, and his doctrine on the Eucharist, will be found in Strype's Annals, vol. i., chap. 52, pp. 559-565. The account concludes thus, "That which I have further to add of this Bishop is, that his enemies laboured to remove him. But he had many friends (as well as adversaries) who valued him. And the Bishop of Chichester being now dead, they laboured much to get him translated thither. But the Archbishop understood it, and signified his dislike of it to the Secretary. And the Bishop himself upon these his Troubles, shewed a Desire to be quite discharged. But the ARCHBISHOP (who LIKED HIM NOT) told the Secretary, that perhaps he meant another thing, viz. to obtain a Reprimand to his enemies from the Court. The last thing I have to relate of him, was, that at length absenting himself from a Convocation, and not appearing upon Summons of the Archbishop, he was solemnly pronounced excommunicated by the same: but soon after absolved, because his absence was affirmed by his chaplain's oath, to be by reason of sickness."

Anthony A. Wood says of Cheney, "One of his successors in the see of Gloc. named Godf. Goodman doth wonder why his master Will. Cambden should say that the said Rich. Cheyne was *Luthero addictissimus*, whereas it was certain that he was a papist, and bred up his servants papists, as he had been informed by one of them, with whom he had spoken. He tells also, that it doth appear upon record in the arches, that he was suspended for popery, and died so suspended, and never would make any recantation." (Athenæ Oxonienses, 1559-60, under "James Brokes." Edit. Bliss, 1815, vol. ii., pp. 791, 792.) Strype however says he did not find anywhere that Cheney was indeed of the Romish Faith "any further than that he was for the Real, that is, the Corporeal, Presence of Christ in the Sacrament." And he argues to the contrary from a letter written to him by Campion the Jesuit "who knew him well" (indeed Campion had been ordained and encouraged in his studies by him according to A. Wood, "Athenæ Oxonienses," vol. i., p. 473, see also p. 476), in which "he tells him that he was *Hæreticorum Odium, et Catholicorum Pudor*." Strype adds, "His suspension which is spoken of, (if true) related, no Question, partly to his being in the Queen's Debt, partly to his *Lutheran Doctrine*: but chiefly to his excommunication." (Annals, Anno 1562, vol. i., chap. 25, p. 282. See also Bennett's Essay on Articles, pp. 187-189. Edit. 1715.)

In the Disputation held in 1553, after Mary's accession, the Papists claimed Cheney as *allowing the presence with them*, and as having "subscribed to the Real Presence." But Cheney appears to have discomfited them by his arguments against *transubstantiation*. He firmly maintained the abiding of the material substance of the elements; and refused to allow the words of Theodoret to be wrested, as denying only *transaccidentation*. (See Foxe's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi., pp. 397, 406, 407.)

deprived by Parker of the exercise of Episcopal jurisdiction which he had received by commission for Bristol, and once by Parker he was excommunicated. And both the withdrawal of the commission and the excommunication are supposed by Strype, and the excommunication is plainly understood by Geste, to be intimately connected with Cheney's Lutheran tendencies.¹

(8) We call to witness the character given of him by Puritans who disliking his ritual strictness charged² him with no doctrinal error.

(9) We call to bear witness also (and the witness is most important) that *consensus* as to doctrine generally, and the doctrine of the Eucharist in particular, a *consensus* of Churchmen and Puritans, which we know to have prevailed in Parker's

¹ "Notice was taken at this session (which was April 23) that Richard, Bishop of Gloucester, had not appeared neither in person nor proxy, in any of these three sessions: and that he had been that day in Westminster, and was gone out of town without any leave asked of the President (whatever was the cause, whether, being Popishly affected in some things, he liked not what was to be done this Convocation, or whether he cared not to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, which was to be done by all the members of the synod, is unknown) . . . it was unanimously agreed by the Archbishop and his brethren, that he ought to be excommunicated, and consequently the Archbishop read the sentence of excommunication against him." (Strype's Parker, book iv., chap v., pp. 318-9. See also Lamb's Historical Account of Thirty-nine Articles, pp. 27, 28; Hardwick on Articles, p. 152, note; and Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. ii., pp. 529-531.)

R. Cheney "was consecrated Bishop [of Gloucester]. . . . The Archbishop of Canterbury issued out a commission to him . . . appointing him his Vicar General . . . to visit, etc. . . . The commission was dated May 3 [1562]. But it was not long before this Commission was taken away from him again, by the Archbishop, disliking most probably some of his principles and opinions. . . . In Sept. he [Cheney] renewed his request that he might have leave to resign his office . . . considering . . . such Preaching was continued in Gloucester Diocese, as his poor conscience could not think to be good. What this Preaching was, we may guess, and but guess at, by the remembrance of a former Bishop there, named Hooper; who did not much affect ceremonies . . . nor allowed of any manner of Corporeal Presence in the Sacrament. Which sentiments most probably were by him or his chaplains so diligently sown in that Diocese, that much of them remained to this day; opinions by no means liked by Bishop Cheney, who was, as Camden saith of him, most addicted to Luther; both in respect, I suppose, of the Doctrine of the Presence, as also for the retaining of many old customs, as Crucifixes and Pictures of Saints in Churches and such like. He has made some complaints to the Archbishops of rash Preaching when he was at London; and the Archbishop promised him countenance in suppressing it. And accordingly he had a commission from his Grace, as was before said. But after some time he and his Principles were better known, and less approved: which caused the Archbishop, as we may conclude, to withdraw his commission. This made him tell the Secretary that his Grace of Canterbury acted contrary to his promise with him." (Strype's Annals, vol. i., chap. 25, pp. 279-281. See also p. 282. See also Strype's Parker, Book iv., chap. 5, p. 317.)

² See his character as given by Neal in History of Puritans, vol. i., pp. 223-4.

days, a *consensus*, of the truth of which we have assurance, not from others¹ only, but from Parker himself, and which others have attributed very much to Parker's own influence.²

(10) We call to bear witness Parker's declared estimation of

¹ See evidence adduced in No. I., pp. 19-22. And add the following: "The admonitioners themselves (which said that they did strive for true religion, and wished the parliament even with perfect hatred to detest the Church of England, whereof notwithstanding they were members), even they do say how they (meaning the bishops and their partakers) hold the substance of religion with us, and we with them. . . ." (Rogers, "Preface to Catholic Doctrine," p. 8.)

"So that for doctrine (I mean still for the main points of doctrine) there was now a sweet and blessed concord among us, which unity continued all that holy and reverend father's, I mean Archbishop Parker's time, which was till the 17 year of Q. Elizabeth." (Ibid., pp. 8, 9.)

This general *consent* on the doctrine of the Eucharist, in the reign of Elizabeth, was but a restoration of the *unanimity* of English Divines on the subject in the latter years of Edward's reign. See the letter of Peter Martyr quoted below, p. 462. See also Paper No. III., pp. 102-105. The following is the testimony of John A Lasco—"Additit gratiam suam Dominus, ut primariæ Helvetiorum Ecclesiæ quæ antea dissidebant inter se primum omnium consentirent. Cœpit deinde mox latius propagari doctrinæ *consensio*, etiamsi non iisdem ubique verbis exprimeretur: et ad Frisiam usque, atque item ad florentissimum hoc Angliæ Regnum pervenit, manue (quod dicitur) utraque (Divino beneficio) retinetur." ("Epistola at Regem" prefixed to "Brevis et Dilucida de Sacramentis Ecclesiæ Christi Tractatio." London, 1552.)

The following extract from the Paper against altars drawn up by the Divines (most probably including Parker) in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, will show clearly what were their feelings towards the Reformed and towards the Lutherans: "It may please your Grace also to call to remembrance, that the greatest learned men of the world, as Bucer, Ecolampadius, Zuinglius, Bullinger, Calvin, Martyr, Joannes Alasco, Hedio, Capito, and many more, have in their Reformed Churches in Sabaudia, Helvetia, Basil, Geneva, Argentine, Worms, Frankfort, and other places, always taken away the altars; only Luther and his churches have retained them. In the which churches be some other more imperfections, as gilding of images, the Service of the Church half Latin, half Dutch, and the Elevation of the Sacrament of the Altar. All which things Melancthon, when he is called to council for a reformation to be had in other places, doth utterly remove. And in Saxony they are tolerated hitherto, only because of Luther's fame; but are thought that they will not long continue, being so much disliked of the best learned. . . . It may also please your Majesty to join hereunto the judgment of the learned and godly martyrs of this realm, who of late have given their lives for the testimony of this truth; as of Dr. Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, who protested in writing (whereupon he was first apprehended) that the order appointed by the last book of King Edward, was most agreeable to the Scriptures and the use of the Primitive Church: and also of Dr. Ridley, Bishop of London, who travailed especially in this matter of altars, and put certain reasons of his doing in print, which remain to this day: of Mr. Latimer, Mr. Hooper, Mr. Bradford, and all the rest, who to the end, did stand in defence of that book. So that, by re-edifying of altars, we shall also seem to join with the adversaries that burnt those good men, in condemning some part of their doctrine." (Strype's Annals, vol. i., p. 162. Edit. 1725. See also Blakeney on Common Prayer, pp. 67, 68.)

² "A principal contriver of this uniformity in religion, and thereby unity among us, was another predecessor of your grace's, even D. Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury in the said Queen's days. . . ." (Rogers, "Preface to Catholic Doctrine," p. 6.)

Peter Martyr and Calvin, and that especially in regard of the controversy with Rome.¹

(11) We call for witness Nowell's express and emphatic denial² of the charge when made by a Romanist in the lifetime of Parker himself.

(12) We call for witness his urging (in conjunction with Grindal) the publication of Nowell's Catechism,³ whose language

¹ "Upon hearing of a Diet for conference of learned men appointed in France, I wished that Mr. Martyr, or Calvin, or both, could be procured thither; they were as able to stand in defence of a truth, assisted by him whose cause it is." (Letter to Cecil in Correspondence, p. 147, date 1561, referring to the Conference between Roman Catholics and Protestants held at Poissy.)

In order to estimate aright the bearing of this letter of Parker's on the question of his views on the Eucharist, they may be read in connexion with the following account of the Conference at Poissy (Sept., 1561). "The Romish party, who assembled in considerable numbers, were confronted by Calvin's chief disciple, the accomplished Theodore Beza, and by other ministers and lay-deputies of the Huguenots: THE MAIN subjects of DISCUSSION being the DOCTRINE of the EUCHARIST, and what was even more intractable, the jurisdiction and Authority of the Church. THE PRINCIPLES of the SWISS REFORMERS were also ably advocated by Peter Martyr, who arrived from Zurich while the Colloquy was proceeding." (Hardwick's History of Reformation, p. 138.) Grindal wrote to Cecil to much the same effect as Parker. (See his Remains, pp. 244-5 and note. See also Jewel; Sermon and Harding, pp. 89 and 94.) Further evidence of Parker's esteem for Martyr may be seen in his *Antiq. Britann.*, as quoted in Goode's "Brotherly Communion," pp. 8, 9.

² Strype writes, "It may be noted, that the Divines in those times seemed not fully agreed in the Doctrine of the Presence: if we may believe what Dorman writ soon after this synod [1562]; viz., That there was a controversy in this New Church (as he called it) concerning the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament. And that Mr. Gest preaching at Rochester, (where he was Bishop) preached for the Real Presence. Mr. Grindal at London (where he was Bishop) for the contrary. To which Dorman added, (to make the Difference in this Article seem greater) that Mr. D. Parker of Canterbury (as he stiled him) being suspected, he said, to be a Lutheran, must hold a third opinion of the Presence. To which it is worth observing as to the Truth of this charge, what reply Dr. Nowell makes: 'That these were small Matters in comparison, however, he called them by the name of Schism, and that they little troubled the State of the Church; while he named one as divers from other in Opinion in one point, and FALSELY surmised of another, (meaning THE ARCHBISHOP) to be a LUTHERAN.'" (Annals, vol. i., chap. 28, pp. 334-5. See Hardwick on Articles, p. 138, note.)

Let it be observed that we have not only Nowell's *positive* DENIAL of Dorman's insinuation concerning Parker; but we have also the testimony of Parker himself (see Paper No. I., pp. 19, 20) and abundant other evidence (see Paper No. I., pp. 21, 22, and note above, p. 434) in proof of the *oneness* of doctrine, and agreement concerning the Eucharist (not of course, to be understood as altogether *without exception*) in Parker's time. See also Bennett, Essay on Articles, p. 187. Edit. 1715.

³ See above, p. 121. There is evidence of Parker's careful perusal and criticism of Nowell's Catechism, and especially in the part concerning the Eucharist. Bishop Jacobson says, "Archbishop Parker has underlined . . . *eaque conjunctione* . . . with his red pencil, and made a note in the margin, which appears to be . . . *hic inserenda plenior vis*, etc." (Note on p. 170.) In compliance with this hint of Archbishop Parker the next Question and answer appear to have been inserted—(see Jacobson's note on "An Ergo," etc., p. 171,) pointing to the equivalent efficacy

on the subject is much too plain and emphatic to be approved by those who hold the Corporal Presence.

(13) We appeal also to Parker's identifying himself with the movement which waged war against *altars*, and would have the Lord's Supper administered at a moveable table of wood.¹

To all this mass of evidence might be added many lesser matters not without their weight; such as² Ridley's confidence in him, and Jewel's;³ his friendship with Becon;⁴ his value for Whitgift; his very tender affection for Jewel;⁵ his pleading (with other bishops)⁶ against images; his desire for the removal of lights and crucifix⁷ from the Queen's closet; his care

of Baptism, whereby *likewise we are of Christ's flesh and bones*. There is a MS. of the Catechism with the autographs of Parker and Grindal at the beginning, and repeated with their approval of the work, in the last page. (See Bishop Jacobson's Preface, p. xix., and quotation from Strype in note m.)

¹ Strype, indeed, speaks only of the address presented to Queen Elizabeth on this subject, as coming from the Divines, among whom he supposes "most *probably* Parker." (See Annals, chap. xii., pp. 159, 160. Edit. 1725. The paper may be seen in Blakeney on Common Prayer, pp. 65-69.) A question, however, might *possibly* be made of this. And further evidence has been sought in vain among the State Papers, and the Lansdowne MSS.

But sufficient warrant for what is alleged in the text, will be found, I believe, in the extract from the Ely Episcopal Registers, given in Gorham's Reformation Gleanings, p. 213. (See also p. 209.)

² "Sir, I pray you refuse not to take a day at the Cross: I may have, if I would call without any choice, enow; but in some, alas! I desire more learning, in some a better judgment, in some more virtue and godly conversation, in some more soberness and discretion. And he in whom all these do concur shall not do well to refuse (in my judgment) to serve God in that place; of the which number by cause I take you to be, &c." (Ridley—Letter to Parker, dated July 25, 1551; in Parker's Correspondence, p. 45.)

³ "Your Grace is *sacra anchora* unto me and others." (Jewel's Letter to Parker, June 16, 1563; in Jewel's Works, P. S. Edit., vol. iv., p. 1262.)

⁴ See Becon's Letter to Parker in Biographical Notice. (Becon's Works, P. S. Edit., i., p. xiii.)

⁵ "The death of one so VERY DEAR to the Archbishop was *extremely afflictive* to him." (Strype's Parker, bk. iv., ch. v., p. 317. See also Annals, vol. i., ch. xxv., p. 281.)

⁶ The letter of Archbishop Parker and others to Queen Elizabeth against images may be seen in his Correspondence, pp. 79-95. The discovery of a *pia fraus* of the Papists, by which an image of the Saviour was made to sweat blood in Dublin, took place about this time. "The Archbishop of Dublin wrote this relation, and to this effect, to his brother-Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker, who was at this time *very joyful at the receipt* hereof, by reason that the clergy were at this present debating whether the images should stand in the churches or no, the Queen herself being then indifferent whether to have images or to destroy them. This letter being shewed unto her Majesty, wrought on her *to consent* for throwing of images out of the churches, together with those texts of Scripture as the *Archbishop of Canterbury* and other divines gave her for the demolishing of them." (See Parker's Correspondence, p. 96.)

⁷ See Machyn's Diary, p. 226.

From the account of the disputation on this subject, in which Parker and Cox were on one side, Grindal and Jewel on the other (see Zurich Letters, i., 67, 68; ii. 41,

to have Foxe's "Acts and Monuments" set up in all cathedral churches;¹ his editing the Saxon Homily of Ælfric;² his high

43), some have apparently been led to think that Parker and Cox must have been decidedly in favour of the Crucifix. (See Hardwick, *History of Reformation*, p. 246, note 4.)

That this was not so as regards Cox, is clear from his letter to Cassander (Zurich Letters, ii., 41), and still more from his letter to P. Martyr (Zurich Letters, i., 66), in which he says—"We are only constrained, to *our great distress of mind*, to tolerate in our churches the image of the cross and Him who was crucified: the Lord must be entreated that this stumbling-block may at length be removed." Indeed, Strype says that Cox, being appointed to minister the Sacrament before the Queen in her chapel, "made it a matter of conscience to do it in a place which he thought so dishonoured by images, and could scarce be brought to officiate there, denying it a great while; and when he did it, it was with a trembling conscience, as he said." (Quoted in Zurich Letters, i., p. 66, note. See also his letter to the Queen in Strype's *Annals*, vol. i., Appendix, No. 22, p. 60; Edit. 1725.)

That it is a mistake also as regards Parker, is evident from (1) the letter of Sir Francis Knollys to him (in Parker's *Correspondence*, p. 97)—"Wishing you prosperity in all godliness; namely, in your good enterprise against the enormities yet in the Queen's closet retained;" and (2) from Parker's own letter to Cecil, after the cross was "brought into the chapel again," in which Parker declares—"Certainly I never knew of it, nor yet in good faith I think it expedient it should be restored." (*Correspondence*, p. 379.) See also Parker's Letter to Cecil, Nov. 6, 1559 (*Correspondence*, p. 105); and Strype's "Parker," bk. i., ch. ix., p. 46; and bk. iv., ch. iii., p. 310. See also Blakeney on Common Prayer, pp. 284-286.

Mr. Keble speaks of the Queen continuing the cross and lights in her private chapel, "in spite of so many remonstrances from her *chaplains of the Frankfort and Geneva schools*." (On Euch. Adoration. Edit. 1867, pp. 149, 150.)

According to this, Parker must have belonged to one of these schools, though his objections may have been somewhat less *pronounced* than those of some others. Hallam says—"I conceive by *cruces* (in Jewel's letter to Martyr) we are to understand crucifixes, not mere crosses; though I do not find the word, even in Du Cange, used in the former sense." (*Constitutional History*, vol. i., p. 173.)

Cassander was in doubt whether his opinion was asked concerning *crosses* merely or *crucifixes* properly. (2 Zur., 43.) But they are called *crucifixes* distinctly. (2 Zur., 41; 1 Zur., 67.) P. Martyr speaks of the *image* of the crucifix. (2 Zur., pp. 25, 47.) And all doubt seems to be removed by the words of Bishop Cox: "The image of the cross and *Him who was crucified*." (1 Zur., 66; where see note.)

Compare Bishop Cox's words. (2 Zur., 41.) See also 1 Zur., 63, 64, 122; and Strype's *Annals*, i., p. 175; Edit. 1725. It will be seen that Strype certainly understands that it was a crucifix which was retained in the Queen's chapel. See also Blakeney on Common Prayer, p. 279; and Gorham's "Reformation Gleanings," p. 435.

"Notum est, reginam Parkero antistite Cantuariensi *acriter repugnante* retinuisse in sacello suo imaginem crucifixi cum candelabris atque candelis. . . . Attamen . . . abrogavit elevationem hostiæ." (Daniel's *Codex Liturgicus*, tom. iii., p. 300.)

¹ See Paper No. V., p. 142.

² The following is a part of the Preface to this Homily:—"As the writynges of the fathers euen of the first age of the Church bee not thought on all partes so perfect, that whatsoeuer thyng hath been of them spoken ought to be receaved without all exception (which honour trulye them selues both knewe and also haue confessed to be onely due to the most holy and tryed word of God :) So in this sermon here published, some thynges be spoken not consonant to sounde doctrine: but rather to such corruption of greate ignorance and superstition, as hath taken roote in the church of long time, being ouermuch cumbered with monckery. As

esteem among those who were far from esteeming highly men of Lutheran views ;¹ his care to have "The Defence of the

when it speaketh of the masse to be profitable to the quicke and dead : of the mixture of water with wyne : and whereas here is also made reporte ij. vayne miracles, which notwithstanding seeme to haue been infarced, for that they stand in their place enaptly, and without purpose, and the matter without them, both before and after, doth hange in itselfe together most orderly : with some other suspitious wordes sounding to superstition. But all these things that be thus of some reprehension, be as it wer but by the way touched : the full and whole discourse of all the former part of the Sermon, and almost of the whole Sermon, is about the vnderstanding of the sacramentall bread and wine howe it is the bodye and bloude of Christ our Saviour, by which is reuealed and made known, what hath been the common taught doctrine of the Church of England on this behalfe many hundreth yeares agoe, contrarye vnto the vnaduisd wrytyng of some nowe a dayes." (Thompson's Edit., pp. lvi., lvii.)

This Preface is signed by Archbishop Parker, the Archbishop of York, and thirteen other bishops ; but not (as Deane Goode observes—Supple., p. 14) by Geste or Cheney.

The following is an extract from the Homily :—"The Apostle Paule sayth, that the Israelites did eat the same ghostly meate, and drink the same ghostly drinke : bycause the heauenly meate that fedde them fourtye yeares, and the water which from the stone did flowe, had signification of Christe's bodye, and his bloude, that nowe be offered daylye in God's churche. It was the same which we now offer : not bodely, but ghostly. We sayd vnto you a little before, that Christ halowed bread and wyne to housell before his suffering, and sayd : This is my body and my blood. Yet he had not then suffred ; but so notwithstanding he turned through inuisible might the bread to hys owne body, and the wyne to his blood, as he before did in the wildernes, before that he was borne a man, when he turned that heauenly meate to his fleshe and the flowing water from the stone to hys owne bloude." (Thompson's Edit., pp. 31, 32.)

Of the doctrine taught by this Homily, in the part referred to in the Preface with comparative approbation, it has been very truly said—"It is undeniably not that of a real presence of Christ's body in or under the elements, but that the elements become in a mystical and spiritual sense Christ's body and blood, as having a spiritual power and influence imparted to them. This is not precisely the doctrine of our best divines ; for, as Hooker says, the sacraments are not really, nor do really contain in themselves, that grace which, with them or by them, it pleaseth God to bestow. . . . But it is very different from what is called the doctrine of the Real Presence ; and the difference between it and the sounder doctrine delivered by Hooker is, comparatively, of secondary importance." (Goode on Eucharist, ii., Supplem., p. 14. See Archbishop Ussher's Answer to Jesuit's Challenge—Works, vol. iii., pp. 85-88 ; Archbishop Wake's "Second Defence," in Gibson's Preservative, xii., p. 390 ; Soames's Anglo-Saxon Church, p. 229 ; Hook's Lives of Archbishops, vol. i., p. 443 ; Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. i., pp. 481-485 ; Freeman's Principles of Divine Service, vol. ii., part i., p. 82 ; Soames's Elizabethan History, pp. 210, 211 ; and History of Reformation, vol. iii., pp. 158-165. Also Soames's Latin Church during Anglo-Saxon Times, pp. 423-433, and p. 466.)

¹ "There have lately been removed from us by death, having obtained a better condition with Christ, Parkhurst, the Bishop of Norwich, and Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England, a man of an even and firm character, and a *zealous defender of true religion*. We must entreat the Lord that He may vouchsafe to send labourers not less suitable into His harvest." (Bishop Cox to Rodolph Gualter, date 1575, in Zurich Letters, i., p. 317.)

Cox's own opinions may be seen in Original Letters, p. 753, and Zurich Letters, ii., pp. 249, 253.

See also Fulke's "Answers," p. 247. This was not the sort of language in which men of opposite views commonly spoke of those who held anything like the

Apology" placed in Parish Churches; ¹ his glorying in having been consecrated without "Aaronical garments" "according to the purity of the Gospel." ²

Let this evidence be weighed in the balances of unprejudiced justice, and, I think, judgment will be given to the effect, that instead of the known opinions of Parker having to be set against the arguments for the natural meaning of our Article—what we can gather ³ of his opinions will rather tend to

Lutheran "Real Presence." By way of contrast, the reader may like to be referred to what Burcher says of Bucer and Fagius, in letter to Bullinger. (Original Letters, pp. 662, 663.) But it must not be supposed that his words echoed the opinion held of Bucer in England.

Fuller says—"He [Parker] confuted the character which one gives of antiquaries, 'that generally they are either superstitious or supercilious,' his skill in antiquity being attended with soundness of doctrine and humility of manners." (Fuller's History, vol. ii., p. 285; Edit. Oxford, 1845.)

¹ See Biographical Memoir of Jewel in Jewel's Works, P. S. Edit., p. xxviii. Parker therefore must have read and approved the "Defence" in which is contained the repudiation of the distinction between "real receiving" and "effectual receiving," as well as the most clear and distinct opposition to the Corporal Presence.

² See Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i., p. 129, and Strype's Parker, book ii., chap. i., p. 61. "He was both the first and only man that attained unto the archbishopleike dignity without any blemish or spot of old wives' superstitions, and unprofitable ceremonies of the Romish Pope, for as every one of them entered first hereunto by bulls of approbation sent them from the Pope: so he was consecrated neither with them, nor any other old and idle ceremonies of Aaron's ornaments, neither with gloves, nor sandals, nor slippers, nor mitre, nor pall, but more chastely and religiously according to the purity of the Gospel, four bishops being appointed according to a law made in that behalf which placed him in his chair with so godly promises protested by him, as it is meet should of a gospel-like pastor." ("The Life of the 70th Archbishop of Canterbury presently sitting Englished," 1574. B. iii., B. iv.)

³ The great historical work of the *Madgeburg centuriators* is not unfrequently referred to by our Reformers. In the history of the Church is "regarded from the standing-ground of Luther." (See Hardwick's Reformation, p. 406.) The *fourth century* was dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, in 1560; and we have a courteous letter from Archbishop Parker to "Matt. Flacius Illyricus and others," returning thanks for a copy. (Zurich Letters, ii., pp. 77-80.) Flacius Illyricus, a strict Lutheran, was the principal writer of the history. The following extract from Parker's letter will show how far he was from professing himself in harmony with the distinguishing doctrines of the Centuriators: "Which doctrine and belief of yours, however it may fail of pleasing every one, yet I openly admit that you have acted ingeniously and sincerely, in having so fully, so entirely, and so clearly and unambiguously declared your mind and sentiments. Yet, upon due consideration of these your opinions, I cannot but lament that there should be some disagreement among us upon the chief controversies of religion, especially as each party is taught by the same rule of Scripture, and animated by the same zeal both for the restoration of the truth and the utter extermination of all error and falsehood from the territories of the Church of Christ. Oh, how great an occasion of falling is here presented to good men! how greatly on this ground is the very restoration of the gospel loaded with reproaches and revilings by our enemies! I wish indeed, that each party would listen to the other without prejudice, and with greater patience and attention; and that neither should be so wedded to his opinion, as to render this public cause of religion an occasion of glorying, ambition and dissent." (Page 78.)

strengthen (if it needed strengthening) our position—and lead us to see here a true disciple of Cranmer, exercising a wise vigilance, after the example of his master, lest the Roots of Evil in the doctrine of the Real Presence should be suffered to grow again in the Lord's vineyard, and overspread all the ground afresh with the old errors and superstitions.

But we have not yet quite done with Parker. Or rather our opponents have something further to allege¹ concerning his part in this article. We have a letter from Parker to Lord Burleigh about it. Some one² had evidently suggested to Burleigh's mind a doubt as to whether the citation in this Article from St. Augustine would be found to establish the teaching of the Article. Burleigh leaves the question to be resolved by Parker, and Parker's letter declares, that having reconsidered the matter, he is of opinion the citation will hold good for so much as it is quoted for. But the whole letter shall be given here.

Archbishop Parker to Lord Burghley, 4th June, 1571:—"Sir, I have considered what your honour said to me this day, concerning St. Augustine's authority in the Article in the first original agreed upon; and I am advisedly still in mine opinion concerning so much wherefore they be alleged in the Article; and for further truth of the words, besides St. Austen, both he in other places, and Prosper, in his 'Sentences wrote of Austen' (Senten. 338 and 339), doth plainly affirm our opinion in the Article to be most true, howsoever some men vary from it." (Parker's Correspondence, p. 381.)

Now the argument of our opponents from this letter stands

¹ See Pusey's "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," p. 237. Forbes on Articles, ii., 588-9. Grueber's Reply to Dr. Heurtley, p. 41.

² Strype says (Parker, book iv., chap. vi., p. 331), "I cannot omit here the mentioning of an argument disputed between the Lord Treasurer and the Archbishop, especially because it relates to one of the Nine and Thirty Articles of Religion, viz.: the twenty-ninth article, *concerning the wicked, that eat not the body of Christ*. Which was not among the Articles of Religion established under King Edward, anno 1552. Some, it seems, had raised a scruple of the sentence of St. Augustine, alleged there, *put in for proof of it, by the Archbishop himself*. And in the first draught of the Articles remaining in Benet's College, in the margin, against this Father's sentence, in the place thereof written by the Archbishop's pen, viz.: Super Joann., tract 26. . . . It seems some Papists had been nibbling at this new Article, and at the said allegation, and in discourse with the Treasurer had declared it to him." See also Annals, chap. 28, pp. 326, 327, ann. 1562.

With Geste's letters, and what we know of the circumstances before us, I shall be surprised if some of my Readers do not make a shrewd guess that the "*nibbling*" came from some to whom Lord Burleigh would be more likely to listen in this matter than to Papists, and who would be much more likely to give themselves the trouble of speaking to Lord Burleigh about it—and that Parker had made the same shrewd guess before, a guess which would require no divination from one who knew well *some* that now *varied* from the teaching of the Article.

thus:—the words, “for so much” clearly imply a limitation. They imply that Augustine’s words¹ might in error have been cited for more, but that the Article only means to cite them with a limited application, and that for that limited application they hold good. But in the natural sense of the article they do not seem to be limited at all.

The answer to this is very simple. Augustine, while asserting that the wicked do not eat Christ’s body—asserted also that, *in a certain* SENSE (or in a CERTAIN WAY) they *did* receive Christ’s body, because they received the sacrament of His body, and the sacrament bears the name of the thing signified by it. Now the doubt that would naturally arise was this:—Could the Article which asserts that the wicked are *nowise* partakers of Christ claim support from Augustine’s words, when he said also that in *some* sense² they do receive His body and blood?³

And Parker’s reply is worthy of a disciple of Cranmer—that the citation is good for so much as the Article says; for the Article is speaking of things REALLY, of a REAL *reception*; and does not go beyond that to deny what may be said to be done or received sacramentally,⁴ *i.e.* NOT REALLY. On this under-

¹ So Dr. Redmayne, after specially alluding to an objection brought from St. Augustine, declared his conviction that the objection was groundless, however some might *vary from this teaching*. The following is from the declaration of Dr. Young: “*To the Fifth Article*: Imprimis, that Dr. Redman said more, whereas St. Augustine said ‘Quod Judas idem accepit quod Petrus,’ that Judas received the same that Peter did; he said, that he understood that of the *Sacrament*; and after the same phrase a man might say, ‘Quod Simon Magus idem baptismum recipit quod Apostoli,’ ‘That Simon Magus received the same baptism that the apostles did,’ when he did receive only the *outward sacrament* to his condemnation; for he said that he thought Christ would not vouchsafe to give His holy flesh to an ungodly man; and this, he said, was always his mind, although he knew well that *other men did otherwise think*.” (See Foxe’s Acts and Monuments, vol. vi., p. 270; and compare Young’s Letter, pp. 272, 273.)

² So Chap. ix. of the “Consensus Orthodoxus,” has this heading:—“Quomodo Impii et indigni manducare dicantur Corpus Christi, et de duplici ejus apud patres appellatione,” and in that chapter it is said “Quo enim modo panis Eucharistiæ est, et dicitur Corpus Christi (hoc est, in mysterio et sacramento) eo etiam modo panem Eucharistiæ manducantes, ab Augustino Corpus Christi manducare dicuntur.” (p. 389.)

³ On the subject of this letter and the omission of the marginal note, see Bennett’s Essay on Articles, pp. 338-341, Edit. 1715; and Swainson’s Essay on Art. xxix., pp. 40, 41.

⁴ Bishop Morton says, “Where [*i.e.*, in the place of St. Augustine] we have a flat opposition, between that which is called (*Revera*) a *real eating*, against *eating only sacramentally*. So that the Antithesis falling between these terms, of eating Christ’s body (*Revera, indeed*), by the godly, and of eating it only (*Sacramento tenus*), *as much as to say*, NOT INDEED, by the wicked. It must necessarily follow, that the wicked do NOT EAT, INDEED, THE BODY OF CHRIST.” (On Eucharist, book v., ch. ii., sec. 9, p. 324—Edit. 1635). And a little further on, referring to another place of St. Augustine, he says. “The only answer which your Cardinal

standing everything in Parker's letter is intelligible, and free (I believe) from all difficulties. But how great a difficulty would be found in it if we were to read it on the other hypothesis!

Here we have Parker clearly declaring that *some* men vary from "our opinion in the Article." Now we know very well there were *some* (Cheney and Geste to wit) who *did* think otherwise than the natural sense of the Article we are contending for. But will any one maintain that *some* were thinking otherwise than *that sense* of the Article which alone the Ritualists would leave in it? Were there any then—any Divines—any English Theologians—any Bishops or Clergy—who were really of opinion that the wicked, and such as be void of a

vouchsafeth is, that *Saint Augustine* spake so, because Judas ate the body of Christ UNPROFITABLY, as if the *difference* of EATING, and NOT EATING Christ's body had been between the *different* EFFECTS, eating *profitably*, and *not profitably*, which you call *spiritually*, and *not spiritually*, which is the EVASION OF OTHERS; whereas indeed the comparison is expressly between the divers SUBJECT MATTERS OF EATING. The one being *Bread, the Lord*, which is Christ's body, the other being *the bread of the Lord*, which is the sacramental bread." (p. 325.)

"Etsi Augustinus Impios et indignos carnem Christi in Sacramento manducare dicat: tamen quia, quæ in *Sacramento* fiunt ab eo, quod est *in re et veritate*, velut *relative* opposita, distinguit, ideo *non tribuit* illis VERAM Carnis Christi manducationem. . . . Promiscua est horum significatio apud Augustinum: *Sacramentum Corporis Christi; Solum in Sacramento Corpus*, et *caro in sacramento*, quæ passim negat idem esse quod Christus, seu ipsum *revera* Christi Corpus. . . . Cæterum quia corporalia hæc sacramenta, etiam ipsarum rerum nominibus, quarum Sacramenta sunt, appellantur adeoque panis Eucharistiæ suo modo vocatur Christi corpus, quia videlicet tam magnæ rei est sacramentum. . . . Duplex est inde Augustino et Patribus, Corpus Christi, Sacramentale, et Verum. Sacramentale corpus nihil aliud est, quam ipsum veri Corporis sacramentum, eo loquendi modo, quo (ut sæpius est annotatum) signum quod significat, rei significatæ nomine appellatur. . . . Secundum hanc diversam Corporis Christi appellationem, alios in *Sacramento* vel *Sacramento tenuis*, alios *REVERA* manducare docet." ("Consensus Orthodoxus," pp. 387-389.)

Thus Beza writes, "Posset tamen propter nonnullos ex Patribus tolerari hoc dictum, Corpus Christi sumi a quibusvis, et a fidelibus quidem dignè, ad vitam: ab infidelibus autem indignè ad iudicium. Sed necessario addenda esset interpretatio, quæ hoc verum esse doceat, quatenus rei signatæ, id est, Corporis nomen ad ipsa signa transfertur." (Tract. Theol. Genev. 1582. Vol. i., p. 210.)

Again, "Excipies Augustinum dicere non tantum *dari corpus*, sed etiam, *manducari, bibi, sumi, accipi, percipi, indigne*. Fateor, sed ea nimirum ratione qua rei significatæ nomen signo tribui alibi declaravit." (Ibid. p. 248.)

"Expendant lectores antitheta, *Sacramento tenuis*, et *re vera edere*; et nulla restabit dubitatio." (Calvin. Instit. lib. iv., cap. xvii., § 34.)

In some such a sense even Hospinian says, "Non negamus accipi a malis: Dominus enim Auctor Sacramenti sui, Judæ proditori suo (ut Augustinus et alii volunt) panem tanquam Corpus suum porrexit eo et dedit. Et porrectum atque datum Judas accepit." (In Works, vol. iv., p. 274.) This was written, however, with the view to justify the acceptance (as by the pacific Bucer and others) of such Lutheran tests on this point, as could only, I think, be accepted with something like dissimulation, or a consciousness of ambiguity, inasmuch as we can hardly doubt they were intended by the Lutherans to be understood *re vera*, however Bucer may have (from excellent motives) persuaded himself to the contrary.

lively faith—do, in receiving the Lord's Supper, receive Christ effectually and savingly to their soul's health? ¹

If not, then it is perfectly evident that this non-natural sense could not be the sense which Parker attached to the Article, because there *were some* who were opposed to THAT SENSE.

It will probably be felt that sufficient evidence has been here adduced to defend the natural sense of the Article from the force of any arguments arising from the views and writings of Archbishop Parker.

But there remains something yet very material to be added.

Add to all this the extreme improbability (should we not rather say the utter impossibility?) of an admirer of Cranmer, using language in framing both the title and the substance of an Article—language in accordance with the heading and the substance of an important ² section of Cranmer's most im-

¹ No doubt those who held the Corporal Presence might be very sensible of the danger of their doctrine being perverted, and very desirous therefore to guard it against popular misconceptions. (See Denison's *Saravia*, p. 143, and *Sequel to Kiss of Peace*, p. 417.) But it is hardly to meet popular misconceptions alone that an Article of Religion should have been purposely framed and added to a collection which had been regarded as complete; especially as any such misconception might very well be said to have already been cut away in the words which concluded the 25th Article: "In such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint Paul saith." It seems difficult to discover what (upon the hypothesis of our opponents) the teaching of the 29th Article would have added to this.

It would, then, have been very hard to believe, without this letter, that Parker had taken pains, in spite of opposition, to bring in a separate and additional Article to be added to "Articles of Religion," and "for avoiding diversities of opinion," which additional Article should assert nothing but what might be called a theological truism, and be aimed at nothing but such a gross popular error, as (on *Saravia's* testimony, p. 111) "no man in his senses hath ever affirmed," and as no one, I suppose, with any degree of education would at that time have thought of maintaining. But it is more than very hard to believe this, in the face of Parker's own assertion, that some now *do* "vary from" our opinion in the Article.

This argument may be yet further strengthened by appeal to the "notable paper," drawn up in preparation for the Synod, 1562, with marginal notes, "some writ by the Archbishop [Parker] himself," (see *Strype's Annals*, vol. i., part i., chap. xxvii., p. 317), entitled, "General Notes of Matters to be Moved by the Clergy in the next Parliament and Synod."

Among these Notes are mentioned "Certain Articles, containing the principal grounds of Christian Religion, are to be set forth (in the which also is to be determined the TRUTH of those things which IN THIS AGE are CALLED IN CONTROVERSY) much like to such Articles as were set forth a little before the death of King Edward."

² Could Parker have studied Cranmer's writings and never have noticed this important section? If any one will maintain that possibly it may have escaped his observation and study, then let the following extract from *Strype* be commended to his consideration:—

"And that I may bring here together all that relates to Cranmer, as to this matter of the Sacrament, I must not omit what I saw in the Benet Library. There

portant work—and supporting that language, as Cranmer there supports it, by appeal to S. Augustin—and yet withal meaning by this language and this appeal, to teach a doctrine utterly discordant from, and in direct opposition to, that which in the treatise of Cranmer stands out with the more unmistakeable clearness, because there it is seen as set in battle array against the very opinions and arguments now aimed against it by the Ritualists, and then¹ by the Papist Gardiner.

is a thin Note-book of this Archbishop's with this Title, wrote by his own Hand, *De re Sacramentaria*, which I verily believe are his Meditations and Conclusions, when he set himself accurately to examine the Sacramental controversy, and fell off from the opinion of the Carnal Presence. The Notes consist of nothing but quotations out of ancient ecclesiastical authors about the Lord's Supper, interlined in many places by the Archbishop's pen. On the top of some of the pages are these sentences writ by himself, being doctrines provable out of the sentences there produced, and transcribed—

Panis vocatur Corpus Christi et Vinum Sanguis.

Panis est Corpus meum et Vinum est Sanguis meus ; figurativæ sunt locutiones. Quid significat hæc figura, edere carnem et bibere sanguinem.

MALI NON EDUNT ET BIBUNT CORPUS ET SANGUINEM DOMINI.

Patres Vet : Testamenti, edebant et bibebant Christum, sicut et nos.

Sicut in Eucharistiâ ita in Baptismo, presens est Christus. Contra Transubstantiationem.

After this follow these writings of the Archbishop's own Hand (*which Archbishop PARKER elsewhere TRANSCRIBED FOR HIS OWN SATISFACTION.*) ("Strype's Cranmer," book ii., chap. xxv., p. 262.)

¹ Lest the reader should think that such a statement must be either a mistake or a grievous exaggeration, I will set down a few sentences, taken here and there out of Gardiner's words, to which Cranmer replies. Gardiner says—"Wherefore if it be more than a figure, as it is indeed, and if by Christ's ordinance it hath present, under the form of those visible signs of bread and wine, the very body and blood of Christ, as hath been truly taught hitherto, then is the substance of the Sacrament one always, as the ointment was, whether doves eat of it or beetles. And this issue I join with this author, that he shall not be able by any learning to make any diversity in the substance of this Sacrament, whatsoever diversity follow in the effect. For the diversity of the effect is occasioned in them that receive, as before is proved. And then, to answer this author, I say that only good men eat and drink the body and blood of Christ spiritually, as I have declared, but all, good and evil, receive the visible Sacrament of that substance God hath ordained it, which in it hath no variance, but is all one to good and evil." (In "Cranmer on Lord's Supper," p. 202.)

Again Gardiner says—"And to all that ever this author bringeth to prove, that evil men eat not the body of Christ, may be said shortly, that *spiritually* they eat it NOT, besides the Sacrament, and in the Sacrament they eat it not EFFECTUALLY to life, but condemnation. And that is and MAY BE CALLED a NOT EATING ; as they be said not to hear the Word of God, that hear it NOT PROFITABLY. . . . For evil men eat not the body of Christ to have ANY FRUIT by it, as evil men be said not to hear God's Word to have any fruit by it." (Page 214.)

"St. Paul's words plainly import, that those did eat the very body of Christ which did eat unworthily, and therefore were guilty of the body and blood of Christ. . . . And therefore to conclude this place with the author, 'whosoever eateth Christ's flesh and drinketh His blood, hath everlasting life,' with St. Paul's exposition, if he doth it worthily ; or else by the same St. Paul, he hath condemnation." (Page 217.)

"And therefore, as good men eating Christ have salvation, so evil men eating

Shall we think that Parker put into an Article of Religion expressions such as Cranmer distinctly stigmatizes as "PARADOXES," and of which he declares that however they may sometimes (though rarely) be used, yet when the VERY TRUTH comes in discussion, then they are "NOT TO BE USED"? (Page 215.)

(2) We have next to deal with the case of Cheney and Geste.

Cheney appears to have been a decided Lutheran, and Geste seems to have partly agreed with him (or, at any rate, to have stood with him) on the doctrine of "the Presence." It is clear that he had some leaning either to Lutheran views, or to the use of Lutheran language.

Two letters have been discovered in the State Paper Office written by Geste¹ to Cecil, both relating to the Articles, and both making mention of Cheney's difficulties. The letters may be seen at length in Mr. Perry's "Declaration on Kneeling," (pp. 192-204). I give the two following extracts. The first is from a letter bearing date December 22, 1566, and is as follows—"I suppose you have heard how the Bishop of Gloucester [Cheney] found himself grieved with the placing of this adverb *onely* in this Article, 'The body of CHRIST is given, taken and eaten in the supper after an heavenly and spiritual manner *onely*,' because it did take away the presence of CHRIST's body in the Sacrament, and privily noted me to take his part therein, and yesterday in mine absence more plainly vouched me for the same. Whereas, between him and me, I told him plainly

Christ have condemnation; and so for the diversity of the eaters of Christ's body, followeth, as they be worthy or unworthy, the effect of condemnation or life; Christ's Sacrament and His work also, in the substance of that Sacrament, being always one. And whatsoever this author talketh otherwise in this matter is mere trifles." (Page 219.)

"Whereby St. Augustine teacheth the diverse effect to ensue of the diversity of the eating, and not of any diversity of that which is eaten, whether the good man or evil man receive the Sacrament." (Page 223.)

"In which thou, reader, seest a denial of that flesh of Christ to be given, to be eaten, that was crucified, but the flesh given to be eaten to be a godly and spiritual flesh." (Page 232.)

Any one, I think, acquainted with the writings of the Ritualists will acknowledge that there is here sufficient to justify the assertion in the text. Let the reader study Cranmer's crushing replies to all this, let him also think of Parker's studying all this, let him also take into account Parker's opinion of Cranmer (see above), and then let him estimate the probability of Parker's penning the 29th Article, and its heading, in the language of Cranmer, to teach the doctrine (concerning eating and drinking) of Gardiner.

¹ The second letter is not signed by Geste, but it gives evidence of being written by the same hand, and is admitted by Mr. Grueber (Reply to Dr. Heurtley, p. 37) to be Geste's.

that this word *onely* in the foresaid Article did not exclude the presence of CHRIST's body from the Sacrament, but *onely* the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof: For I said unto him, *though he took Christ's body in his hand, received it with his mouth, and that corporally, naturally, really, substantially and carnally* as the Doctors do write, *yet did he not for all that see it, feel it, smell it, nor taste it.* And therefore, I told him, I should speak against him herein, and the rather because the Article was of mine own penning. And yet I would not for all that deny thereby anything that I had spoken of the presence." (Quoted from "Goode on Eucharist," Supplem., pp. 5, 6.)

The second is from a letter without date, but written, no doubt, in 1571, just after the 39 Articles had been agreed to in Convocation, and placed before Queen Elizabeth. It is as follows. . . . "Yet for all this to avoid offence and contention the word *onely* may be well left out, as not needful. My L. of Gloucester is pronounced excommunicate by my lord of Canterbury and shall be cited to answer before him, and other bishops to certain errors which he is accused to hold. I think if this word *onely* were put out of the book for his sake it were the best.

"It followeth in the book, But the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith. If this word *profitably* were put hereunto in this sort, But the mean whereby the body of Christ is *profitably* received and eaten in the supper is faith, then should the occasion of this question, whether the evil do receive Christ's body in the Sacrament, because they lack faith (which riseth of the foresaid words and causeth much strife), should be quite taken away, for that hereby is not denied the *unfruitful* receiving of Christ's body without faith, but the fruitful one affirmed.

"My L. grace of Canterbury is purposed to present to the Queen's Majesty the first copy of the book of Articles (to the which the most part of the bishops have subscribed) to have it authorized by her Majesty, and there is this Article:

"Evil men¹ receive not the body of Christ, which Article is

¹ This Article "had been accepted indeed by Convocation in 1562, but had not been suffered to appear in the printed copy of the Articles, as set forth with the assent and sanction of the Crown, some adverse influence having been brought to bear against it." (Heurtley's Remarks on Declaration, p. 26. See Lamb's Historical Account of Thirty-nine Articles, pp. 34, 35; Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. i., pp. 38, 39; and Bennet's Essay on Articles, pp. 233-235. Edit. 1715. Swainson, Essay on Art. 29, pp. 30, 31, note.)

not in the printed books either in Latin or English. IF THIS ARTICLE BE CONFIRMED and AUTHORISED by the Queen's grace it will cause much business, because it is quite contrary to the Scripture and to the doctrine of the fathers, for it is certain that Judas as evil as he was did receive Christ's body, because Christ said unto him, Take, eat, this is my body." (Quoted from "Goode on Eucharist," Suppl., pp. 9, 10.)

These extracts not only throw light on the views of Bishops Geste and Cheney, but also on the relation in which those views were felt to stand towards the Articles of the English Church.

Cheney felt there was for him a *crux* in the 28th Article which declares that the body and blood of Christ are received *only* after a heavenly and spiritual manner. The *crux* might be removed by the omission of the word "*only*." But Geste had, perhaps, been labouring to get the Article so worded, as at the same time to satisfy the requirements of the Bishops, and yet in language which Lutherans might (in some sense) accept. And perhaps with this view had inserted that word "*only*." At any rate, it appears, Geste could let the "*only*" remain and find in the Article no repudiation of the Lutheran Presence. In discourse therefore with Cheney he had justified the Article and the word "*only*," declaring that it was his own¹ penning.

And here we see the true wisdom, and vigilance, and care, and (in this matter) the like-mindedness to Cranmer, of Archbishop Parker, in that he saw that the 28th Article with all its plain teaching would serve as an insufficient test to exclude those dangerous roots of "the Real Presence." That Article indeed declares that the body of Christ is² "given, taken, and

¹ Meaning probably, the alterations made in the Article in 1562, for as Dr. Heurtley has observed, "the Article itself had formed one of King Edward's Articles published ten years before." (Remarks on Declaration, p. 22.)

² This declaration also was added by Archbishop Parker; (Geste, it must be supposed, having had a hand in "*pennynge*" it somehow). See Lamb's "Historical Account of the Thirty-nine Articles," p. 14.

Strype supposes that Parker designed these words as a new Title for a separate Article. He says (in Annals, vol. i., chap. 28, anno 1562, Edit. 1725, p. 326), relating "a few things which I took notice of in the perusal of Parker's MS. Articles of 1562 in Benet College Library."—"Article the 28th of the Lord's Supper, being somewhat long, the Archbishop thinking to have it divided into two, after *occasionem*, added of his own hand, this Title, that was to serve for another Article, 'Corpus Christi datur, accipitur et manducatur in Cœnâ, tantum cœlesti et spirituali ratione.' And then the Article begins 'Christus in Cœlum ascendens Corpori suo immortalitatem dedit,' etc.; but there is a red line drawn through it, as though he intended upon second thought wholly to leave it out." Art. 29th,

eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner:" and that "the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." And it is true that this language exactly described and was, no doubt, intended (though by Geste designed to bear a further sense) to describe, that giving¹ and taking and receiving which belong

"In the margin the Archbishop sheweth the particular place where, writing *Super Johannem, Tract 26.*" (See Strype's Parker, book iv., chap. 5, p. 320, and Hardwick on Articles, pp. 313-315.)

Strype's account, however, of the two MSS. of the Articles bequeathed by Parker to Corpus Christi College, is pronounced by Lamb to be "materially incorrect." (Preface to Historical Account of Thirty-nine Articles, p. iv.) Strype considers the strokes with red minium as marking the alterations made by Parker before presenting the copy to the Upper House of Convocation.—Lamb regards the MS. before marking as exhibiting Parker's changes on the Articles of Edward, and the red minium marks as denoting changes made in the Convocation. (See pp. 13, 16, 17.)

Bennet says, "The first Period of that which is so underdrawn and cross'd, viz., these words (*Corpus Christi datur accipitur et manducatur in cœna, tantum celesti et spirituali ratione*) was certainly written by the Archbishop himself, it being in his own hand, who found room, between the conclusion of the foregoing Paragraph, and the beginning of what the Transcriber had made a new Paragraph, viz., *Christus in cœlum*, etc., to write down the aforesaid words. With what view the Archbishop wrote them down, I can't say; but however, his own red Lead Pencil, as was before observed, has effectually dashed them out again, with much more that follows. . . . All these instances were most certainly, either alterations resolv'd on in Convocation, or the Copyer's Mistakes Corrected." (Essay on the Articles, Edit. 1715, p. 180.)

Speaking of the alterations made by the Upper House of Convocation, Lamb says, "Their chief attention seems to have been directed to the twenty-eighth, 'De Cœnâ Domini.' They finally agreed so strike out this clause; *Christus in cœlum ascendens . . . vel credere vel profiteri.* By reference to the printed copy of the manuscript it will be seen that Parker inserted in the break left between the concluding words of the preceding sentence, '*Superstitionum dedit occasionem*' and the first words of the following, '*Christus in cœlum*,' the sentence, '*Corpus Christi datur accipitur et manducatur in cœnâ tantum celesti et spirituali ratione.*' It might perhaps be discussed whether this clause should be the title to an article commencing with the words '*Christus in cœlum ascendens, etc.*' It was however ultimately determined to erase it; and the article concluded with the clause before introduced by Parker, '*Corpus tamen Christi datur accipitur et manducatur in cœnâ tantum celesti et spirituali ratione, medium autem quo Corpus Christi accipitur et manducatur in cœnâ fides est.*'" (Pages 17, 18.)

Might it not tend, perhaps, to harmonize facts and statements, if we were to suppose that the insertion "in the break" of "Corpus Christi, etc." (as well as the marking out "*Christus in cœlum*," etc., etc.) was made at one of the secret meetings of the Bishops (of which we have mention in the *Synodalia*. See Cardwell, vol. ii., pp. 505, 509, 510, 512); and that the insertion was made at the suggestion of Geste, and subsequently enlarged and set at the end—as a substitute for the expunged passage? Thus Geste would think to obtain a concession in the removal of an obnoxious declaration, while satisfying the other Bishops by the introduction of a statement which by others might be thought equivalent, but which, in his own sense, Geste could subscribe. This supposition, however, would not be altogether without its difficulties.

¹ See Appendix, Note D.

to the actings of the soul¹ corresponding, in things spiritual and unseen, to the sacramental actions in things outward and visible. But from another point of view they might possibly be accepted by Lutherans. They might possibly be made to endure the pressure which would force a Lutheran sense into them. They might be accepted even by Geste as signifying that the Presence, though conveyed in the Elements, was not cognizable by the senses of the body. If this Article had stood alone, Cheney would have desired, and Geste would have preferred, the word "*only*"² omitted, but Geste could have signed it; and Cheney with Geste's explanation might *possibly* have been brought to accept it too.

There needed something more, there needed something more testing yet, to exclude the Real Presence in Luther's sense. And that something Parker desired to supply. And though difficulties and hindrances were set in his way, yet he carried his point, and the 29th Article, which had previously in 1562 been accepted by Convocation, was added to our Articles for avoiding diversities of opinion. And even Geste was now made to feel that a test was applied, which his views, or Cheney's at least, could not stand.³

¹ The following is the argument of Ursinus from the manner of reception, "Ait, esse modum cœlestem. Atqui IN CÆLO *non manducatur ore corporis*: et Corpus Christi versatur ibi tantum visibiliter, palpabiliter, circumscripte et localiter, neque ingreditur aut existit intra hominum corpora. *Si ergo CŒLESTIS est iste præsentia et manducationis modus, non est oralis, neque impiis communis.*" (Consideratio Commonefactionis Chytræi, in Works of Ursinus, vol. ii., p. 1180, Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

² It may be observed that the "*tantum*" of Geste's penning was directly contradictory to strict Lutheran language, as will be seen by the following extract from the Formula Concordiæ. "Credimus, docemus, et confitemur, corpus et sanguinem Christi *non tantum* Spiritualiter per fidem, sed etiam ore, non tamen Capernaitice, sed supernaturali, et cœlesti modo, ratione Sacramentalis unionis, cum pane et vino sumi." ("De Cœna Dom." *Affirm.*, vi., p. 600 of "Concordia, Pia et unanimi consensu, etc." Lepsizæ, 1654.)

³ Mr. Perry's argument (in "Declaration on Kneeling," p. 205, sqq.) appears to me to rest on the assumption, that, if Article 28 was open to two interpretations, Article 29 must needs be so also.

It is surely sufficient answer to observe that Geste himself *did* not, because he evidently *could* not, so understand it.

Mr. Perry says, "It is enough surely for those who hold the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, to be able to maintain—that they are entitled to hold and teach that doctrine because the terms of the Article (28th) do 'not exclude' it, and that this is affirmed by the Bishop who drew up the Article." (Page 205.) I happen to have in my possession Dean Goode's own copy of Mr. Perry's work.

And, I think, I cannot do better, than put down by way of answer, what I find written here in the margin by Dean Goode,—“I have shewn that Geste's object was not gained, because another Article was introduced *contrary* to the meaning he affixed to those words: and therefore a subscriber to the Articles cannot fairly interpret the words in that sense.”

Now, at least, he was constrained to acknowledge, that there was insuperable repugnance between Lutheran views and the declared doctrines of our Church.

It appears then to me to be, for them, a most unfortunate argument, which has been built on the letters of Geste, by those who maintain the Real Objective Presence. If we had not the 29th Article, and if we had only Geste's first letter to Cheney, it might have stood them in good stead. It might have served to show that a mind such as Geste's could find room for Lutherans to sit down on, even in the language of an Article, which to most ears would sound against them.

But as it is, we have another letter from Geste which refers to Article the 29th; and from this it appears, that one who in that day seems to have had the very same tendency as our modern Ritualists, to strain every cord to the uttermost to make room for Lutheran views, felt that now he was overmatched by the wisdom and foresight of Parker—that even he, who could justify the “only” in Article 28th,¹ can do nothing now but

¹ The 28th Article declared that the body and blood of Christ are given, taken, and received only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, and that the mean whereby the body and blood of Christ are received and eaten in the supper is faith.

How strongly the NATURAL language of Lutheran doctrine stands in contrast with this, may be seen by comparing the words of the Lutheran formula quoted above, p. 449, note.

It will be observed that the Lutheran Article distinctly *denies*, and that the English Article as distinctly *asserts*, the reception of the *Res sacramenti* after a *spiritual manner ONLY*.

The same Lutheran Formula condemns the assertion—“Corpus Christi in Sacra Coena non ore una cum pane sumi: sed tantum panem et vinum ore accipi: corpus vero Christi spiritualiter duntaxat, fide nimirum, sumi.” (See Goode on Euch., ii., p. 648.)

The words of the Article must have been supposed by Parker to convey obviously the anti-Lutheran sense, if it were his first design (as Strype thinks), or the first design of the upper house of Convocation, to make these words to be the heading of a new Article, which should embody the statement which before formed the conclusion of this Article. It must be obvious, I think, that in Geste's sense the words so employed would be quite out of place.

If this design has been carried out, the Lutheran “Real Presence” would, no doubt, have been in *words* more distinctly condemned. Humphry and Sampson, therefore, disapproved the change. (Zur. Letters, i., p. 165.) But it would appear probable that Convocation, after mature consideration, preferred relying upon statements which would serve as effectual tests of doctrine, while avoiding the condemnation of the phrase “Real Presence.” (See Lamb's Historical Account of Thirty-nine Articles, pp. 15-18; and Copy, No. ii., pp. 12-13; and Burnet's History of Reformation, vol. i., p. 583, Edit. Orr, 1850.)

It may be added, that the words of the 28th Article must have been understood (as it seems to me) by the Bishops at the Savoy Conference in their natural anti-Lutheran sense; since they gave it as a reason for the needlessness of the Black Rubric, that its sense was “sufficiently declared in the 28th Article.” (See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 354.)

strongly condemn the language of Article 29th, because it is too evident, that that Article speaks language which quite unmistakeably condemns the "Real Presence" of Luther. Geste would not repudiate one word in Article 28; he would claim it all his own, because he would not see his own views, or the views he desired to shelter, repudiated by it.

He rejects and repudiates entirely the teaching of Article 29, because it is plain that he *must* see that the doctrine of the Lutherans is rejected and repudiated by *that*.¹

Agreement there might be, though some might think it a very forced agreement, between Lutheran views and the words of the 28th Article. But between such views and the words of the 29th Article no argument could ever be forced.

And do I not see how we could find, or desire to find, stronger evidence than is furnished by Geste's second letter, to the fact—not only that in the theological language of the Reformation the 29th Article *did* NOT *naturally* mean, but also that it *could not* in that language anyhow be *forced into meaning* that which some modern theologians would constrain it to mean.²

Bishop Geste asks³ to have a word inserted in Article 28, that it may not appear to deny reception by the wicked. How clearly does this show that the moot question, in its testing character, is being dealt with! But what does he get in answer to his request? That one word inserted? No. But, instead, an Article *is* inserted, which, by his own shewing, positively

¹ See Appendix, Note E.

² Will any one, after reading Geste's second letter, maintain that in the theological language of the time the Article did *not* speak to, and did not speak distinctly and decidedly about that *moot* question (the reception by unbelievers,) which was felt to be so important and so testing?

If not, the whole controversy as to the meaning of the 29th Article is at an end. And then, not only so, but then surely the whole controversy as to the doctrine of the English Church ought to be regarded as at an end also. For here the Church of England has *spoken* to the testing question, and that in a *separate* Article, and in an Article *added on purpose*, and added to Articles *made for the purpose* of "avoiding of diversities of opinions."

³ I have said nothing in the text of Geste's suggestion for inserting "in dede." It is (in substance) not only in the place quoted from Jewel, but also in Hooper, (see Paper No. VI., p. 205,) and in Nowell's smaller Catechism. (Ibid. p. 196.) Its insertion would have been perfectly unobjectionable, and would have added nothing to the true meaning of the Article. The rejection of this suggestion was but the rejection of an *emphasis*. But, inasmuch as this emphasis was desired by Geste in the interest of Lutheran views or Lutheran language, it may perhaps be right to observe, that even non-compliance with this very innocent request was added to the rejection of every other suggestion he made. Geste's discomfiture, in the matter he was aiming at, was a *complete* discomfiture.

and distinctly *states* that very denial which the insertion of that word might (as he hoped) have taken out of the other.¹

(3) It only remains for me now to deal with the allegation—that the Article *cannot mean* to say that unbelievers do not eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood, because the Article cites the authority of St. Augustine, and St. Augustine²

¹“We see from Bishop Geste’s own letter that he clearly saw that for the maintenance of his doctrine, that evil men receive the body of Christ, it was necessary that in the statement of the 28th Article, that ‘the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith,’ the word ‘profitably’ should be inserted before ‘received,’ and he proposed the addition, and complained that Archbishop Parker had sought to obtain the sanction of the Queen to an Article, to which ‘the most part’ of the Bishops had subscribed, stating that ‘evil men receive not the Body of Christ.’ But when the Articles appear, with the Queen’s authority, the Article thus sanctioned by Parker and the subscribing Bishops is among them, and the word ‘profitably’ not added to the 28th. Can there be a clearer proof of the opposition of Parker and the subscribing Bishops to Geste’s views, and of the meaning intended to be conveyed by the Articles? If Bishop Geste really wrote the whole of the 28th Article with the view of drawing up a statement which should express both his own doctrine and that of the majority of the Bishops, it is clear that he attempted to do what was impossible. And the result was, that while he was compelled to word it so as to express the doctrine of the majority of the Bishops, he was obliged to leave himself only a non-natural construction to fall back upon in his defence. And when a revision of the Articles was in hand, and one openly and directly opposing his doctrine was about to be added, he applied to the Prime Minister to get the additional Article rejected, and his own wording of the 28th altered so as to express his doctrine, but without success.” (Goode, ii., Supplement, pp. 26, 27.)

Mr. Perry says—“The *non-insertion* of this word [*profitably*] is no proof that it was *rejected*.” (On Declaration concerning Kneeling, p. 214.) Perhaps not, if this particular point were regarded alone, though it would afford some strong presumption against the approval of Geste’s views. But viewed in connexion with the failure of all Geste’s proposals, and the insertion of the Article he so strongly deprecated, the design of the *non-insertion* can hardly be mistaken, and its doctrinal importance can hardly be set aside.

The fact too, of Geste’s thus appealing to the interference of the State authority (by which the 29th Article had apparently been suppressed in 1562) seems to indicate (as well as his reference to the other Bishops, and particularly Parker) that he felt that his views had to meet the powerful opposition of the Episcopate, and that his only hope was in influencing Cecil.

²“The Article must then be explained according to St. Augustine’s meaning, as it relies on his authority alone . . . or we must say with respect to this Article, as Bellarmine does upon St. Augustine, that the wicked receive not the Lord, that is, as the Lord.” (Sancta Clara, Lee’s Edit., p. 67. See Pusey’s “Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church,” p. 259, sqq.; and Forbes on Articles, ii., p. 581, sqq.; Denison, as quoted in Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 659; Grueber’s Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1856, pp. 5-10; and Reply to Dr. Heurtley, p. 41.)

It is scarcely necessary to point out the mistake of Sancta Clara. When the reference to St. Augustine stood in the margin, the Article might (perhaps) be said to *rely* on his authority, though not on that “alone.” But there is now no such reference, and the Article simply adopts St. Augustine’s words; and it is but of secondary importance whether the framers were careful about using them in St. Augustine’s sense—though, in point of fact, they did use them in his sense.

believed that evil men do, in the Sacrament, eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood.

To enter into a critical examination of St. Augustine's teaching on the subject of the Eucharist, would lead to a long digression, and one quite unnecessary for our present purpose.

There is reason to think that his writings¹ on this subject have been tampered with, and their sense twisted and turned by interpolation, as ancient writings have too often been tampered with, that they may be brought into harmony with modern Romish developments of doctrine.

Any, indeed, who may be disposed to take it for granted that St. Augustine *did* hold that evil men really receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, may be asked to read what Bishop Morton and² Bishop Jeremy Taylor have written

¹ See Goode on Eucharist, i., pp. 350-365, and ii., pp. 659-664, also (for further evidence as to St. Augustine's views) i., pp. 250-255. "An examination of the additions will show at once, that they were made with a view to make the passage *capable of an interpretation* suitable to the then received doctrine. . . . As both the Archdeacons (eager to get a supposed argument against Article xxix.) contend that the words in brackets are not Augustine's, (and in that I agree with them,) I suppose we may conclude that the passage is to stand here denuded of these additions; and I ask the reader whether we could wish for a passage more expressly limiting the EATING—not merely the *worthy* eating, or the *spiritual* eating, but the EATING AT ALL—of the body of Christ to those that dwell in Christ, and in whom Christ dwells?" (pp. 356-7.) The passage from St. Augustine thus cleared, reads thus: "He that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, beyond doubt NEITHER EATS *His flesh*, NOR DRINKS His blood; although he eat and drink to his condemnation the Sacrament of so great a thing."

² I will put down here the headings of certain sections in Bishop Morton's work on the Eucharist, which in connexion with this subject may be specially commended to the consideration of the reader.

Book v., chap. 2, sect. 1. "That only the *godly-faithful* communicants are partakers of the *body and blood of Christ*; and thereby united to Christ; in the judgment of Protestants."

Ibid. sec. 4. "That the *wicked receivers* are called *guilty of Christ's body*, not by properly eating of His body unworthily, but for unworthily eating the Sacrament thereof *symbolically*."

Ibid. sec. 7. "That only the *godly Christians* are partakers of the body and blood of Christ, and thereby *united* unto Him, is NOT *contrary* to the judgment of ancient Fathers, as is objected."

Ibid. sec. 8. "That the *ungodly* do not communicate of Christ's body in receiving the Eucharist, is the determinate judgment of antiquity, and consequently argueth a No-Corporal *presence* of Christ, as an *union* with him in the Eucharist."

Ibid. sec. 9. "That Saint Augustine, (*to whom both sides appeal*), is a DIRECT PATRON of our PROTESTANT CAUSE, for proof, that the wicked EAT NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST; and consequently an adversary to the Romish faith of a Corporal Presence in this Sacrament; noting also an egregious depravation of a testimony of Saint Augustine, by a Romish doctor."

Ibid. sec. 10. "A vindication of a special testimony of Saint Augustine, in the same point, against the notorious falsifications of his word, by Doctor Hoskins."

Book v., chap. 3, sec. 2. "Proving the objected Saint Augustine to contradict the Romish doctrine of Corporal Presence, AS PROTESTANTLY as can be."

on this subject, before they allow themselves to come to any such conclusion.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor's writing on the subject will be found in "Real Presence." (Sec. vii., 9, vol. vi., pp. 71-3.) The following brief extracts may be acceptable. "S. Austin . . . (1) dogmatically declares that the wicked man *does NOT EAT* Christ's body truly; (2) he *DOES EAT* it *Sacramentally*; (3) that to eat with effect, is to eat Christ's body truly; to which if they please to add this, that to eat it spiritually is to eat it with effect, it follows by S. Austin's doctrine that *spiritually* is *really*, and that there is no true and real body of Christ eaten in the Sacrament but by the faithful receiver. . . . Neither can this be put off with saying that the wicked do not *truly* eat Christ, that is, not to any benefit or purpose, but that this does not mean they receive Him not at all. . . . Because S. Austin opposes *sacramental* receiving to the *true* and *real* . . . he says they do *NOT AT ALL* receive Him *TRULY* . . . and he proves this by unanswerable arguments out of Scripture. . . . He calls that which the wicked eat *nothing but* *SIGNUM Corporis et sanguinis*."

See also J. Patrick, on Transubstantiation, chap. xiii. in Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. ix., p. 231, sqq., also the quotation from St. Augustine in p. 230. The title of chap. xiii. is "The Fathers assert that the faithful only eat Christ's body, and drink his blood in the Eucharist, not the wicked. Whereas they of the present Roman Church extend it to both." Quotations from Augustine will be found in pp. 235-237. See also pp. 44-48, and Gardiner's *Examination of Roman Catholic Faith*, in vol. xiv., pp. 284-5. See also Archbishop Ussher's *Works*, vol. iii., pp. 60-62, and the conclusions of Albertin "out of St. Austin's works," in Bingham, *Book xv.*, chap. 5, § 5. Vol. v., pp. 254, 255. See also Hospinian; *Historia Sacramentaria*, Pars i., Liber ii., in *Works*, vol. iii., p. 72, sqq., especially pp. 87, 88, 89; Geneva, 1681. And Calvin's *Works*, vol. viii., p. 690, sqq., especially p. 692; Amsterdam, 1667.

Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, makes a concession with regard to *some* passages of St. Augustine's writings. Speaking of the reception of the *res sacramenti* by the wicked, he says, "the great voice of antiquity, with the *exception of SOME passages in St. Augustine*, supports this view." (On Articles, vol. ii., p. 574. See p. 582, sqq.)

Mr. Cary says, "Augustine's testimony is as clear as possible, not only in the place referred to by the Article, but also in many others." (Testimonies of the Fathers, p. 337.)

Admitting that there are to be found in the writings of St. Augustine two classes of passages, one very distinctly denying the reception of the *res sacramenti* by the wicked, the other seeming to speak a different language, the reader may be asked to consider (1) which of these two classes is most likely to contain interpolations (see Goode on Eucharist, i., pp. 357-361; ii., 664-6); (2) which of these two classes is most likely to contain such passages as may be called *testing* passages, or passages which may be regarded as true tests of St. Augustine's doctrine (see note on No. 3, p. 99, sqq., and especially the words there quoted from Archbishop Longley). Surely to such passages as seem to speak of the reception of the *res Sacramenti* by the wicked, it is but fair to apply St. Augustine's own rule of interpretation—that the Sacrament of Christ's body is called Christ's body, because sacraments have the name of the things of which they are sacraments. (See Cranmer on Lord's Supper, pp. 104, 224, 225, 281. Ridley's *Works*, pp. 40, 41. Hutchinson's *Works*, p. 56. Bradford's *Sermons*, pp. 87, 88, 533. Sandys's *Sermons*, pp. 453-4, notes. Whitgift's *Works*, iii., pp. 111, 112. J. Patrick in Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. ix., p. 142, etc., etc. Goode on Eucharist, i., pp. 513-4, 516-7, 262-3, 359, 362, 364.)

But where is the key that can (without forcible straining) be so applied to the interpretation of the other class of passages, as to make them speak of any *real* reception by the ungodly?

There is also a further consideration not without its weight in determining St. Augustine's true meaning in doubtful passages. I mean his bearing witness to the

But even suppose the very contrary to be proved, or suppose that modern criticism should lead decisively to the conclusion that many of the *words* quoted in the Article are not really St. Augustine's at all:¹ still the doctrine of our Article would remain untouched and unshaken by any such discoveries.

By all means, let the question of St. Augustine's opinions of this subject be argued fairly, and sifted thoroughly. We acknowledge the importance of the issue in its relation to the Eucharistic controversy, in that branch of it which is concerned with the views of the ancient Fathers. If it can be shewn, let it be shewn, that St. Augustine has been altogether misrepresented. We do not fear the result of the enquiry, if only St. Augustine be allowed to be the interpreter of his own language.

But as regards the question which is before us—the interpretation of our Article—it is plain that we are concerned, not with the doctrine of St. Augustine, but with the doctrine his words are alleged as supporting, or illustrating.

It will not anyways affect the sense of our Article, if any theologian of the English Church should now say, "I am persuaded that it is a mistake to suppose that St. Augustine's views stand opposed to the corporal presence and the oral manducation, and I am prepared to argue the matter; and I think I can make it appear that St. Augustine rather supports than opposes such a view." Even supposing for a moment such a theologian to enter the lists, and to come out of the controversy victorious in the estimation of all; yet the sense of our Article would be untouched by the result. To affect the interpretation of the Article, it must be shewn, not only what St. Augustine's views are, but that at the time of the Reformation they were univers-

truth that the body in which Christ rose must be in *one* place. (See Bradford's Sermons, pp. 90, 91, and notes. Ridley's Works, pp. 176, 215, 216. Cranmer on Lord's Supper, pp. 140, 141. Grindal's Remains, p. 53. Hooper's Early Writings, pp. 192-194. Jewel, Apol. and Defence, pp. 253, 254, 257, 258, 259, etc., etc.; Bishop Stillingfleet in Gibson's Preservative, vol. ix., p. 311, sqq., and J. Patrick in vol. ix., p. 169, sqq.; Goode on Eucharist, i., pp. 298-301, 309-312, 503.)

The application of St. Augustine's teaching on this matter to the subject of the Eucharistic presence, is forcibly expressed in the following passage:—

"Quanto minus a communione Eucharistiæ plurium locorum substantialis illa sub pane veri corporis Christi præsentia probari aut constare potest, si ne phantasmaticum quidem illud Manichæi, quod Christo tribuebat, corpus, simul totum in sole, et lunâ, in arboribus, et herbis esse possit, sed alium subinde atque alium Christum corporali ista præsentia esse, fierique oporteat?" (Consensus Orthodoxus, Edit. 1605, p. 199. See also Bishop Bilson's True Difference, pp. 786-791.)

¹ Which Dean Goode admits to be the case. (See On Eucharist, ii., p. 660.) The *statement*, however, is, no doubt, *substantially* St. Augustine's. See above, p. 453.

ally felt, and by all confessed, to be clearly and unmistakeably against what we contend for as the natural meaning of our Article. If this could be shewn, we should at once acknowledge the serious damage it would inflict on our arguments. But, so long as it is notorious, that the claim to the authority of St. Augustine was set up by the Reformed as declaring for them in opposition to the views of Papists and Lutherans alike—so long as it is a matter of history that this claim, however hotly disputed by some, was (in a kindred point of the controversy¹) frankly conceded by Luther himself—so long it will be vain to aim at overthrowing the sense of our Article by new investigations of the writings of St. Augustine.

To look at the matter only and exclusively from an English point of view, it must be clear—and, indeed, it is fair to state that it is admitted by some of our strongest opponents—that what is essential in this enquiry is not what St. Augustine may have meant, but what our Reformers meant—"not what St. Augustine taught, but in what sense the framers of the Article have adopted [or rather moulded] his words as expository of the doctrine of the Church of England." ■

So that in order, in any degree, to shake our arguments as to the natural sense of the Article, it must be shewn, not only (if it can be shewn) that St. Augustine's teaching does not support the doctrine contained in the natural sense of the Article, but that our English Reformers did not so understand St. Augustine's teaching.

Let THIS be shewn, and we will admit the force of the argument.

But THIS, so far as I know, none have attempted to shew. And very sure I am, that if any attempt had been made, it would have proved a void and fruitless attempt indeed.

¹ It may perhaps be considered fairly open to question, whether Luther's concession of Augustine and Fulgentius was to be understood in relation to the whole matter of controversy with Zuingle and Æcolampadius, or only to the particular point on which their authority was then being pressed.

If, however, it be supposed to be confined to that one point, it must be noted that that point was not simply Christ's corporal presence *having a locality in heaven*, but rather the consequent impossibility of His being, *in corporal presence*, at the same time in any other place. ["Zwinglius ex Fulgentio legit, quod Christus sit in uno loco." Again: "Augustinus dicit, in uno loco esse oportet." Hospinian, Hist. Sacrament; in Works, vol. iv., p. 126; Geneva, 1681. See "Goode on Eucharist," i., pp. 301, 309, 311, 314, 315.]

But if this be so, it will scarcely be denied that all teaching of *re vera* oral reception, and therefore all *real reception* by the wicked, must needs also be *excluded* from St. Augustine's teaching, and his authority on these points be *included* in Luther's concession.

² Denison, quoted in "Goode in Eucharist," ii., p. 664.

The consensus of our Reformers in denying the reception of the *res sacramenti* by the wicked and unbelievers, is most striking and most significant. We may surely be thankful for the conclusive evidence it affords of the determinate and distinctive character of our English Reformation, under the application of such a decisive test of the doctrine of the Eucharistic presence.

But if *this* is a striking feature in the writings of our Reformers, not less striking is the continual recurrence of an appeal to St. Augustine,¹ and an appeal for this very purpose—that St. Augustine may bear witness to the doctrine they maintained—the denial of the wicked participating at all, or receiving and eating at all—in any *real* sense—the thing signified by the outward sign or sacrament which they eat to their condemnation.

Of the many examples of this, one—*instar omnium*—shall be set down here, because it is the testimony of Bishop² Jewel,

¹ Not unfrequently to the sentences of Prosper also. And this will be sufficient answer to Dr. Pusey's argument, from the fact of Parker's referring to Prosper in his letter to Lord Burleigh. (See *Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church*, pp. 275-277.) See Hutchinson, *Works*, p. 265; Becon, *Catechism*, etc., p. 292; Becon, *Prayers*, etc., pp. 433-4 and 463 (see Editor's note 16), and 464; Grindal's *Remains*, p. 59.

Hutchinson says—"Paul speaketh there of unworthy receivers, which do not eat Christ's body, which is the bread of life, but the only figure and sacrament thereof; and they do eat the said *only* sacrament and *only* figure to their judgment and condemnation, as I have proved. This is not my doctrine, but the doctrine of Hierome, of Ambrose, of St. Austin, of PROSPER, and of Bede, as is declared in the beginning of this lesson." (Hutchinson's *Works*, p. 280.) See also Archbishop Ussher, *Works*, vol. iii., p. 61; "Goode on Eucharist," ii., pp. 663-4.

² "As Bishop Jewel was not only an Episcopal member of the Convocation in 1571, in which this Article was added, but actually had the final revision of the Articles before publication committed to him, his judgment on the meaning of this passage is of primary importance; and it will be observed that he quotes it precisely as it stands in the Article, in that form which, it is contended, cannot mean what we attribute to it." ("Goode on Eucharist," ii., pp. 810, 811.) It should be observed, however, that Jewel's citation retains the word "spiritually" which the Article, so significantly, rejects.

He (Jewel) "attended that Parliament, and the Convocation in which the Articles were again revised; and it was determined, May 4, that 'when the book of Articles touching doctrine should be fully agreed upon, then the same should be put in print by the order and direction of the Bishop of Sarum,' (*i.e.*, Jewel). This accordingly was done; so that he may justly be said to have set the *finishing hand* to our present Articles." (Biographical Memoir of Jewel, in *P. S. Edit.*, xx. See Strype's *Parker*, book iv., chap. 5, p. 319.)

"Thus was the finishing hand put by Jewel in 1571 to the Articles of our Faith, which were first promulgated by Cranmer in 1553. During this period they had been carefully revised and altered (as it has been shewn) by Parker; and examined and confirmed by no less than five-and-twenty Bishops, a body of divines which was never equalled at any period of the Christian Church, in Biblical learning, Divine knowledge, and practical Godliness." ("Lamb's Historical Account of Thirty-Nine Articles," p. 32.)

who not only was a member of the Convocation (1562) in which the Article was framed, but had himself to do with finally reviewing and publishing the Article we are considering.

"To come near to the purpose, St. Augustine saith: 'Outwardly they have the Sacrament of Christ's body; but the thing itself (which is Christ's body represented by the Sacrament) inwardly in their hearts they have not. And, therefore, they eat and drink their own judgment.' Here St. Augustine saith, they are guilty, not because they receive, but because they receive not the body of Christ. Mark well these words, M. Harding: they are effectual. The wicked, by St. Augustine's judgment, are guilty, not because they receive, but because they receive not the body of Christ.

"Again he (*i.e.*, St. Augustine) saith: 'Whoso abideth not in Christ, nor Christ in him, out of doubt he eateth not spiritually His flesh, nor drinketh His blood; notwithstanding carnally (that is to say, with the bodily mouth) and visibly he do press with his teeth the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; and rather eateth and drinketh (*not Christ's very body and blood, but*) the Sacrament of so great a thing, unto his judgment.' These words, M. Harding, be *so plain, that I cannot imagine what ye should more desire*. They are guilty of the blood of Christ, for that they despise the price wherewith they were saved, not for that they receive it really into their mouth." (Defence of Apology, P. S. Edit., pp. 894, 895.)

Again: "You may not negligently pass over these words, M. Harding: St. Augustine saith plainly: 'The THING itself that is represented by the Sacrament (that is to say, THE VERY BODY OF CHRIST) is *received* of ALL MEN TO LIFE, and of NO MAN TO DESTRUCTION, whosoever shall be partaker of it.' Hereof you must needs conclude against yourself, that the WICKED *receive NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST*." (Ibid. p. 895.)

If need were, many¹ other examples might be adduced of the oft-recurring use which our Reformers made of this testimony of St. Augustine—to the doctrine they so constantly maintained, and which, with a fair light fairly thrown upon it from their writings, it is, I maintain, absolutely impossible for us to doubt, they have embodied in the words and language (so exactly in harmony with their own words and language) of the 29th Article, which has for its title, "Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper," and

¹ See Appendix, Note F.

which has for its declaration that "The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint *Augustine* saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

Thus, then, I have completed (however imperfectly) the work which I set before me, in entering upon this series of Papers.

It might, indeed, have very well come into my subject to consider the Thirty-first Article, in reference to that Sacrificial teaching which forms a branch of the "Real Objective" Doctrine.

But that portion of the subject is wide enough, and important enough, to demand for itself a separate consideration.

I trust it may be undertaken by some pen more competent and better furnished for such a task than my own.

I have only to add here, that it has been no part of my desire or intention to exalt any particular view of the mode of the Eucharistic Presence, or the repudiation of any other view, into the position of an Article of the Faith.¹ I have only desired

¹ It must not be forgotten, that to give room, or to find room in the Church of England, for the teaching of the Real Objective Presence (as it is taught by those who hold it as *de fide*) is to find room for the teaching of that, *which TO BE TRUE TO ITSELF, must* be willing to allow room for no other doctrine to be either taught or held on the subject, which *must* seek to cast out what has been the teaching of the English Reformed Church for three hundred years, which *must* not only brand as heretics Cranmer and all our Reformers, but *must* also put on its *Index* the writings of Hooker, * and Morton, and Jeremy Taylor, and of our great English Theologians generally, which *must* seek to shut the mouth of every Minister of the Gospel, who desires to speak as our Reformers spake, and to teach the truth as our Reformers taught it; nay, more, which *must* desire, for the minds and hearts of *all the members* of the Church, to bar the admission of that belief, which is embodied in our Articles, and which we have received as a sacred deposit from the hands of our fathers, and (must I not add?) from the fires of our Martyrs.

To say this is to accuse our opponents of no want of charity. It is to charge them with no *desire to be* intolerant. Their principles *require* this of them. Professing what they profess, they could not do otherwise without being inconsistent with their profession. Believing as they believe, it would be a want of real charity in them to do otherwise.

If the doctrine comes in, it must (in its nature) *come in to stamp out* (as I believe) every spark of that light of Protestant Truth which our dying Reformers trusted would never again be put out in England.

* Notwithstanding what has been said against my statement concerning Hooker in No. III., p. 90, note, it will be acknowledged, I can hardly doubt, by all who will read carefully Book v., ch. lxvii., pp. 348-362 (Edit. Keble), that Hooker certainly *does* take his own stand among that *third* class, whom he speaks of as *termed* Sacramentaries, and whose doctrinal position he (so firmly and ably, and yet withal so calmly and temperately) defends.

I can but ask of those who may be disposed to question this, to read and judge for themselves.

to shew—and I certainly believe that I have shewn—that the Church of England has of set purpose rejected from her teaching, a Doctrine which I conceive to tend to superstition and delusion, and that, therefore, she has a just right to expect her Ministers not to teach—much less to teach as *de fide*—the dogma she has carefully eliminated from her Service Book, and deliberately denied in her Articles.

Let me conclude by asking forgiveness (in all sincerity) of any whom, in this controversy, I may unwittingly have injured or offended—beseeching for myself and for my opponents pardoning mercy and enlightening grace, of Him, who giveth to all richly and upbraideth not, and through Him alone, whose Flesh is meat indeed, and whose Blood is drink indeed.

APPENDIX.

Note A, p. 408.

If it be asked in what sense our English Reformers adopted this word "effectual" (efficacia) as applied to the sacramental signs, it might suffice to refer to the quotations made in the fifth Paper of this series as justifying the language of our Homily (p. 172, sqq.). But it may be useful to illustrate the use of the word by the following extract from an important and interesting letter written by Peter Martyr, from Oxford (where he was Regius Professor of Divinity), June 14, 1552, between the time of the completion of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI., and the setting forth of the 42 Articles. "Things remain to a great extent as they were before, except that the Book or Order of Ecclesiastical Rites and the Administration of the Sacraments has been reformed, for all things have been removed from it which could nourish superstition. But the chief reason, that prevented the other things which were purposed from being effected, was the matter of the sacraments: not truly as far as regards transubstantiation, or the real presence (so to speak), either in the bread or in the wine: since, thanks be to God, concerning these things there seems to be now no controversy as it regards those who profess the gospel; but, whether grace is conferred by virtue of the sacraments, is a point about which many have hesitated. And there have been some who have altogether affirmed that doctrine, and were desirous that a decision should be given to that effect. Concerning which, because others clearly saw how many superstitions that sentence would bring with it, they endeavoured at first in all ways to shew, that nothing more is to be granted to the sacraments than to the external word of God: for by both these kinds of words is signified or shewn the salvation obtained for us through Christ, of which as many are made partakers as believe these words and signs, not in deed by the power of the words or sacraments, but by the efficacy of faith. Moreover it was added, that it was impossible that the sacraments should be worthily received unless the recipients have beforehand that which is signified by them; for without faith they were always taken unworthily: but, if they who come to the sacraments are endued with faith, they have already through faith laid hold upon the grace which is proclaimed to us in the sacraments; the after reception and use of which is the seal and oblation of the promise already received. And, as the external words of God avail to the

awakening and arousing faith, often torpid, and in a manner laid asleep in us, this same thing also the sacraments can effect by the power of the Holy Spirit, and their use is not of little benefit to confirm our minds, otherwise weak, concerning the promises and grace of God." (P. Martyr's Letter to Bullinger, June 14, 1552, in Bradford's Works. P. S. Edit., ii., pp. 403-4.)

In this letter there are three things specially deserving of attention.

- (1) Martyr's testimony that all things had been removed from the Prayer Book that could nourish superstition.
- (2) His testimony that "THE REAL PRESENCE" was, at that time, *out of* the controversy.
- (3) That as to the matter which was *in* controversy (whether or not sacraments ought to be said to *confer grace*) those who took the *lowest view*, spoke of what "*the sacraments (facere possunt) can EFFECT*" (*i.e.* in other words spoke of them as *EFFECTUAL signs*) "by the power of the Holy Spirit": just as our Article says "whereby *He* (God) doth work invisibly in us (*in nobis operatur*). And so at the conclusion of the Article the Latin words "*salutarem effectum habent*" are rendered in the English "have a wholesome *effect* or *operation*." "*He [Christ]*" says Cranmer (from whose pen the words in the Article probably came) "*is EFFECTUALLY present, and EFFECTUALLY worketh, not in the bread and wine, but in the godly receivers of them, to whom He giveth His own flesh spiritually to feed up, and His own blood to quench their great inward thirst.*" (On Lord's Supper, pp. 34, 35.)

Hooker says "We take not Baptism nor the Eucharist for bare *resemblances* or memorials of things absent, neither for *NAKED SIGNS* and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, but (as they are indeed and in verity) for *means* *EFFECTUAL* whereby GOD when we take the sacraments *delivereth* into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify." (Vol. ii., Edit. Keble, p. 258.)

It must not be supposed that the phrase which Martyr objects to "*conferre gratiam*," and its equivalents, as applied to the sacraments, was by any means the *property* of Lutherans. (See Hardwick's Reformation, p. 246, and note 4, and on Articles, pp. 392, 94, 95.) The expression (or something similar) is used by—

- (1) Bishop Hooper. (Later Writings, p. 45, "such signs as do *exhibit and give* the thing that they signify indeed.") (See Hardwick's Reformation, p. 219, note 5.)
- (2) Bradford, who speaks of the sacraments as "signs which do . . . confirm, and seal up, or (as a man may say) *give* with their signification." (Sermons, etc., p. 94.)
- (3) Archbishop Parker. (Heads of Religion, 1560, in Strype's Annals, vol. i., p. 216, Edit. 1725, "*duo Sacramenta . . . quibus confertur Gratia ritè sumentibus, etiamsi malus sit Minister.*") (See Hardwick's Reformation, p. 219, note 5.)
- (4) Dr. Ward, delegate at the Synod of Dort. ("Sacramenta

ista, quæ signa *efficacia* appellat articulus noster xxiv., *conferre gratiam dicimus*," quoted by Hardwick on Articles, p. 392.)

Dr. Ward supports his language by reference to

- (5) Hooker, whose teaching may well be said to justify the appeal (see Dr. Ward's letters in Ussher's Works, Edit. Dublin, 1847, vol. xv., pp. 506, 510, referred to by Hardwick); and
- (6) Calvin ("non objecto inani aut vacuo signo, sed efficaciam sui illic proferens, quâ impleat quod promittet. Et sane rem illic signatam *offert* et exhibet," etc. Instit., lib. iv., cap. 17, sec. 10, 11).
- (7) Beza (who says "obsignari non potest quod non habetur," quoted by Ward in Ussher's Works, vol. xv., p. 511).
- (8) Ursinus (saying "Sacramentum est opus Dei erga nos, in quo dat aliquid scilicet signa et res signatas, et in quo testatur et se nobis offerre ac dare sua beneficia." Also quoted by Ward as above).

But the Heads of Doctrine of 1560 do not carry only the authority of Archbishop Parker. They also (according to Strype, Annals, vol. i., p. 213, Edit. 1725) had the sanction of

- (9) Bishop Cox, by whose pen the "Interpretations" to which they belong are supposed to have been framed, and
- (10) "The Bishops" generally, by whom (in conjunction with the Archbishop) these "Interpretations" were "drawn up in writing."

It need scarcely be added that in using such language, our English Reforming Divines are not to be understood as meaning that sacraments *contain grace*, or *confer* or *give* grace "by the work wrought,¹ as they say, or by any power that remaineth in the outward signs." (On this subject see especially Becon, Catechism, pp. 218-220, and Prayers, etc., pp. 466-469.) Hooker says, "for the use we have His express commandment, for the *effect* His conditional promise. . . . We are not to doubt but that they *really give* what they promise, and *are* what they signify." (Edit. Keble, vol. ii., p. 258.) But again he says, "As for the sacraments, they *really exhibit*, but for aught we

¹ The expression "*ex opere operato*" is of frequent occurrence in the writings of our Reformers and their successors. It is always used by them to express a view of sacramental efficacy which they rejected. And this use serves to mark their clear sense of the difference between their teaching and the teaching of the Church of Rome on this point. It does not imply any ignorance of the Romish distinction between the effect "*ex opere operato*" and that "*ex opere operantis*." (See e.g. Jewel, "Harding, Thess. etc.," pp. 750, 754, 755, 756.)

That the difference between Romish and Reformed doctrine as indicated by this expression is real (though it may sometimes have been exaggerated,—see Pusey, "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 242-246; and Forbes, "Considerationes Modestæ," tom. ii., p. 611. Edit. A. C. L.) can hardly admit of question. (See Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, pp. 221, 222, 223, 232, 246, 247. Bishop Harold Browne on Articles, pp. 593, 600-602. Edit. 1868. Rogers on Articles, pp. 247, 248. P. S. Edit. Chamier, Panstrat. Cathol., vol. iv., pp. 25-28, especially p. 26 a, 1627; and Willet's Synopsis Papismi, vol. v., p. 36.)

can gather out of that which is written of them, they *are not really* nor *do really contain* in themselves that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow." (Pages 352, 353.)

Fulke says—"Our wrangler in this place after a flat lie solemnly avouched against us, of that we say, the sacraments give no grace *ex opere operato*, 'of the work wrought,' he frameth a spider's web, first, 'that we deprive them of all grace, virtue, and efficacy;' because we do not *include* grace, virtue, and efficacy, *within the external elements*, or the *ministry of man* about them, but ascribe the same to the mighty work of God's Spirit in His chosen children, which worketh all His gifts in all men according to the good pleasure of His own will." (Defence of Translations, p. 450.)

Hooper says "that the sacraments are not of any force by virtue or strength of any outward work of the same (which of superstition is called *opus operatum*), but only by the virtue and means of the Holy Ghost working in the hearts of the doers and receivers by faith." (Later Writings, p. 125. See especially Rogers on Articles, pp. 247-250, 268.)

Ridley says—"True it is, every sacrament hath grace annexed unto it instrumentally. But there is divers understanding of this word 'habet,' 'hath:' for the sacrament hath not grace *included* in it." And again, in reply to Watson's "Every sacrament of the New Testament *giveth* grace," Ridley replies—"This sacrament hath a *promise of grace*, made to those that receive it worthily, because grace is given *by it*, as by an *instrument*; not that Christ hath transfused grace into the bread and wine." (Works, pp. 240, 241. See Jewel—"Harding, Thess.," etc., p. 781; and Bullinger, Decad., v., vol. iv., p. 305, sqq.)

The following is from a divine whom Archdeacon Hardwick regards as "a zealous fellow-worker" with Parker. (See Hardwick's Reformation, p. 247.) He "took an active part in the Synod of 1563."

"Some will demand whether the grace of God be contained and shut up in the sacraments, and so derived into them which receive them? *Responsio*.—The school divines, monks, friars, and other of that sort, do judge the very virtue of God, yea, and God Himself, to be contained in the sacraments. Whereupon riseth this frivolous and vain question, that is, What the mouse doth eat, when she doth gnaw the sacrament. . . . The Holy Scriptures do teach in every place, that the mind of man and no element is the house of God's grace. Solomon doth say . . . If the heaven of heavens do not containe thee, how much less this house!" (Bishop Alley's *Πρωχομουσείον*, Poor Man's Library, tom. i., p. 177 a; Edit. Day, 1565.)

The following is from the learned Dr. Andrew Willet:—"The *Papists*. The sacraments give grace '*ex opere operato*,' by the work wrought; that is, by force and efficacy of the work and word done and said in the sacrament. . . . The *Protestants*. The sacraments have no power to give or confer grace to the receiver: . . . *of themselves* they have *no operation*, but as the SPIRIT of God *worketh by them*,

Neither do we say, that the sacraments are bare and naked signs of spiritual graces : but they do verily exhibit and represent Christ to as many as by faith are able and meet to apprehend Him. . . . *Faith is not as the dryness of the wood to the sacraments as the fire, but rather as the kindling of the fire which inflameth the wood : so faith giveth life to the sacraments, whereby itself is inflamed and more increased.*" (Synopsis Papismi, Edit. 1852, vol. v., pp. 36, 38.)

Bishop Lake says—"Though sacraments be ceremonies, yet are they ceremonies of efficacy. Were they only of significancy, the Church might have some power to ordain them ; but being of efficacy, their ordination belongeth onely to God : because the efficacy floweth from his Spirit, and of his Spirit none can dispose but himself." (Bishop Lake's Sermons, "De Tempore," p. 163 ; Edit. 1629.)

Ambrose Fisher says—"Though sacraments do not actively, physically, and by infusion confer grace, yet none but public enemies to all sacraments will deny that they bring grace passively, and by the assistance of the concurrent Spirit of God." (Defence of the Liturgy, p. 115 ; London, 1630.)

Let it be noted, that Melancthon expressed himself as to the efficacy of the sacraments thus,—"*Ut in ipsa actione Spiritus Sanctus adest baptismo et est efficax in baptisato ; sic cum sumitur cœna, adest Christus ut sit efficax. Nec adest propter panem, sed propter sumentem.*" (Quoted in Hardwick's Reformation, pp. 63, 64, note ; Edit. second.)

Let it be noted also, that Luther himself at one¹ time taught that "*sacramenta novæ legis sunt EFFICACIA signa gratiæ, si credas, ET NON AMPLIUS ;*" and that these words are quoted with approval in the "*Consensus Orthodoxus*" of Gualter (p. 124, Edit. 1605), which adds—"Recte his et aliis locis Lutherus sacramenta definit esse visibilia signa, seu pignora promissæ in verbo gratiæ, quibus in fide his utentibus CONFERTUR et obsignatur. Qua Lutheri definitione CORPORALIS PRÆSENTIA² non magis contineri, et vel ad signum novi testamenti, quod credentibus gratiam promittit, vel ad ipsam promissam gratiam referri potest, quam in Augustini definitione possit." The "*Consensus Orthodoxus*" approves also of the teaching "*Sacramenta esse talia signa, a Deo instituta, ut iis legitimè utenti detur et*

¹ Bucer says—"Jam et Lutherus primus omnium, hoc quidem seculo, impugnavit sententiam illam scholæ ; sacramenta ex se conferre gratiam, sine bono motu cordis, absque fide. Itaque et in hac quæstione oppugnavit Zuinglius quod Lutherus non affirmavit." (*Retractatio in Scripta Anglicana*, Basil, 1577, p. 644.)

² Compare the following from Melancthon :—"Adest filius Dei in ministerio Evangelii, et ibi certo est efficax in credentibus. Ac adest non propter panem, sed propter hominem. . . . Sed hanc veram et simplicem doctrinam de fructu, nominant quidam cothurnos : et postulant dici, an sit corpus in pane, aut speciebus panis. Quasi vero Sacramentum propter panem, et illam Papisticam adorationem institutum sit. Postea fingunt, quomodo includant pani : alii conversionem, alii transubstantionem, alii Ubiquitatem excogitarunt. Hæc portentosa omnia ignota sunt eruditæ vetustati." (Melancthon's "*Judicium de Controversia Cœnæ Domini*," 1559, in Works of Ursinus, vol. ii., p. 1429 ; Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

CONFERATUR gratia, quasi ex pactione divina, qua se ad gratiæ collationem hac sacramentorum institutione adstrinxit.”¹ (Ibid. p. 125.)

Moreover Œcolampadius expressly calls the Eucharistic elements a “*signum efficax*.” He says, “Non dicimus panem hunc nudum quidem signum in cœna, sed *efficax* quodammodo, operante Spiritu sancto.”

And these words of Œcolampadius are quoted with high approval (1) by Bullinger, in his Commentary (p. 209, Zurich, 1539) on 1 Cor. xi.; (2) by R. Gualter, in the “*Consensus Orthodoxus*.” (Præf. Apol. under “Non sumus Sacramentarii.”)

It may be added, that Beza speaks not seldom of the “*efficacia sacramentorum*,” or uses equivalent language. See *e.g.*, his Tractat. Theol. (Geneva, 1852), vol. i., p. 24, under xxxi., “*Definitio Sacramenti*,” and the words quoted with approval from St. Augustin under xxxii. (“*majoris efficacîæ*,” etc.); and p. 25 under xxxiii.; and p. 30 under l.; also p. 207, under 2, “*Unde efficacia illa Sacramentorum?*” and p. 216, “*Symbola vera et efficacîæ plena*.”

Rodolph Gualter will be found in his Commentary also attributing to the Sacraments “*efficacia illa propter Christi institutionem*.” (In Acta Apost. Homil., Zurich, 1577, vol. i., p. 8.)

Nay, Peter Martyr himself earnestly maintains the “*efficacia sacramenti*,” contending that the consecrated elements in the Eucharist are made to be “*signa efficacîæ*,” as will be seen by the following extracts from his “*Tractatio de Sacramento Eucharistiæ, habita Oxonii*.” Speaking of the Zuinglians, he says, “*Deinde non adjecerunt semper ei efficaciam quæ illi debetur. Non enim efficiuntur ista vulgarîa signa, sed quæ potenter atque efficaciter animum permoveant*.” And the margin here has “*De efficacîâ sacramenti*.” (Loci Communes, vol. i., p. 1627. Basle, 1580.) And a little further on he says, “*Non itaque auferenda est hæc mutatio a pane et vino, qua reddantur signa corporis et sanguinis Christi efficacîa, id est, quibus potenter et non vulgariter Spiritus Domini in nos agat, modo fide et pietate simus præditi*.” (Page 1627.)

¹ Compare the following from the Confession of Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople, 1631. “*Credimus Evangelica Sacramenta . . . esse duo, constare verbo et elemento, esseque signacula promissionum Dei, et conferre gratiam non dubitamus; ut autem sacramentum sit integrum, opus esse ut concurrat res terrena, et actio externa, cum usu rei terrenæ a Christo Domino instituto, atque cum vera fide conjuncto, quia fidei defectus præjudicat integritati Sacramenti*.” (In Corpus et Syntagma Confessionum, Part ii., p. 59; Edit. Geneva, 1654.)

[NOTE.—This is from the Confession of Cyril Lucar, whose history is probably well known to many of my readers. His Confession has since been rejected and condemned by the Greek Church, and a very different doctrine concerning the Sacraments in general, and the Eucharist in particular, distinctly enunciated. See Kimmel’s “*Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiæ Orientalis*,” Jena, 1850, pp. 457-463, 451, also 126; and Prolegomena, p. xxi., sqq. See also Koecher, Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ et Catechetiæ, etc., pp. 58-60, 1751. Some account of Cyril’s history, and of the repudiation of his doctrine will be found in “*The Christian Observer*,” April, 1870. See also Horneck, “*The Crucified Jesus*,” pp. 145, 146; London, 1727.

In 1721 the Patriarchs of the Greek Church, reasserting Transubstantiation, pronounced the Eucharistic doctrine of the non-jurors to be *blasphemous*. See Lathbury’s History of the Non-Jurors, p. 325.]

Elsewhere he speaks of "Sacramentorum effecta." (Page 1503.)

Moreover, not only does the former confession of Helvetia contain an article (No. 20,) "Of the force and *efficacy* of the sacraments," but the latter confession of Helvetia (1566) expresses distinctly its *disapproval* of those who regard the sacraments as *not effectual signs* ("signa efficacia,") thus, "Neque probamus eorum quoque doctrinam, qui de sacramentis perinde loquuntur, ut *signis* communibus, non sanctificatis aut *efficacibus*." (Sylloge Confessionum, p. 79. Oxford, 1827.)

Calvin's Catechism teaches "Vim *efficaciamque* Sacramenti . . . totam a Spiritu Dei manare." (In Works, vol. viii., p. 25, Amsterdam, 1667.) And in his "Expositio" of the Consensus Tigurinus, Calvin says "Quæritur, quænam Sacramentorum *efficacia* sit." (Ibid. p. 654.) And in his "Secunda Defensio" against Westphal, he says, "De legitimo Sacramentorum usu, dignitate et *efficacia* reverenter me scripsisse, ne ipse quidem negat." (Ibid. p. 659.)

Calvin also in his work, "De verâ participatione, etc.," 1561, declares, "Ea parte ipsius Dei non proponi *vacua signa*, sed veritatem et *efficaciam* simul conjunctam esse." (See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 477.)

Again, Calvin denies that unbelievers, "dum respuunt quod datur" do "quicquam ex Sacramenti *efficacia* detrahere." (Page 479.)

Moreover, even Œcolampadius declared, "Aversamur tanquam sanctæ Ecclesiæ Christi hostes . . . qui . . . aut nudum absque *efficacibus* promissionibus *symbolum* ac ludum arbitrantur." (See his letter to Bucer in Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, 1530, in Works, vol. iv., p. 187. Geneva, 1581.)

Hospinian says, speaking of the reformed, "ut vera et *efficacia* Sacramenta in Cœna ex Domini instituto considerant." (Concordia Discors. In Works, vol. v., p. 49 a.)

Chamier says, "Diximus utrinque concedi Sacramenta in signis, non illis vulgaribus . . . sed *efficacibus*. Et *efficaciam* hanc in eo esse, ut gratia spiritualis, quam significari nemo negat, etiam reapse exhibeatur. . . . Sed hoc cujusmodi sit *efficaciæ* genus, longa contentio est." (Panstratiæ Catholicæ, tom. iv., p. 25 a, 1627. See also p. 28.)

Rogers says (On Articles, p. 247, P. S. Edit.), "Infinitely doth God declare His unspeakable and incomprehensible good will to manward, yet in these days by none outward things more notably and *effectually* than by the sacraments. . . . This truth do the *purser churches of these days everywhere acknowledge*."

It may be worth while, perhaps, to notice that while the sentence in our Article is evidently framed from the Augustan Confession, Article xiii., the word "*efficacia*" does *not* occur in the corresponding sentence of the Lutheran formulary, which reads thus:—"Sacramenta instituta esse, non modo ut sint notæ professionis inter homines, set multo magis, ut sint *signa et testimonia* voluntatis Dei erga nos." (See Sylloge Confessionum, pp. 127 and 173.)

The word "*efficacia*," as applied to the sacraments, does, however,

occur in Article viii., an Article which was thoroughly approved, (as was the other teaching concerning the sacraments in general,) by the Reformed. (See Hospinian as quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," vol. ii., pp. 984, 985. The different wording of the German and Latin of this Article may be seen side by side in Pusey's "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 39, 40.)

It is also found in the ninth of the xiii. Articles, which appear to have been agreed upon between the Lutheran and English divines in 1538. (See Hardwick, on Articles, pp. 61 and 268.)

This Article condemns the teaching that sacraments confer grace. "Ex opere operato." And, as regard adults, may be said to expand the early *dictum* of Luther, that sacraments are "*efficacia signa*,"—"si Credas, et non amplius."

Note B, p. 415.

"If it had been intended that Article XXIX. should merely express the truth that wicked men do not in the Sacrament partake of Christ to the benefit of their souls, the framers of that Article would surely have simply inserted the actual words of St. Augustine, which run thus (the words between brackets are supposed by the Benedictine editors to have been interpolated):—'By this, he who abides not in Christ, nor Christ in him, without doubt eats not [spiritually] His Flesh nor drinks His Blood [though he carnally and visibly press with his teeth the Sacrament of His Body and Blood], but rather, he eats and drinks to his condemnation, the Sacrament of so great a thing.' The framers of the Article, it will be observed, left out this word 'spiritually' in the title, and in the Article itself added the words 'in nowise are they partakers of Christ,' and explained the word 'sacrament,' in the last clause, to mean simply 'sign,' as though to avoid the possibility of misconception. See Harold Browne on the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 727." (Principles at Stake, p. 145.)

Mr. Grueber takes notice of this, saying, "It will be seen that it might have been cited either as saying of the wicked '*nec manducant Carnem ejus*,' or according to the Benedictine edition, '*nec spiritaliter manducant Carnem ejus*.' Now that the expression '*nec manducant*,' without qualification, or reference to other Formularies, might have been construed as denying that the wicked do eat the 'Thing signified' in the Sacrament is plain, though indeed it would not have denied that they 'receive' it; but it is equally plain that the expression '*nec manducant spiritaliter*' neither did nor could deny it, but rather, on the contrary, is affirmative of it. Indeed it is remarkable that the entire passage of St. Augustine cited with '*spiritaliter*' appears in the Roman Office, '*In Festo Corporis Christi*.'" (Reply to Dr. Heurtley, pp. 39, 40.) The argument which Mr. Grueber would build on this rests on the assumption that the words "in nowise are partakers of Christ" [*nullo tamen modo Christi participes efficiuntur*] expresses much less than "*nec manducant*." Indeed, it

would appear, I think, that in Mr. Grueber's opinion, if the Article had said that "the wicked do not receive Christ's body," the Real Objective Presence would have been *excluded*; but that the declarations that they "do not EAT Christ's body," and "are in NOWISE PARTAKERS of Christ," are intended not to *exclude* it, but to *make room* for it. CAN ANYTHING, I would ask, BE FOUND IN THE WRITINGS OF THE TIME, AND IN THE WRITINGS OF OUR REFORMERS, TO WARRANT SUCH A DISTINCTION?

I am aware indeed, that it may be pleaded that Herbert Thorndike has spoken of "the *dead* faith of them that receive *it* to their condemnation in the Sacrament, and therefore cannot be said to *eat* the body and blood of Christ (which is only the act of *living* faith)." (See Thorndike's Works, Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. iv., part i., p. 38.)

But, in answer, I observe,

I. That, though Thorndike's views are confessedly very peculiar and exceptional (see Abp. Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., pp. 74, 75), yet I am fully persuaded that his views (truly understood) are very far indeed from lending any support to the "Real Objective Presence," and in particular, that when he speaks of "*dead faith receiving it*," he does not mean receiving the REAL BODY of Christ, but that *sacramental body*, which he *calls* Christ's body, because of an objective presence (independent of faith) *not* of the *body*, but of the *Spirit* of Christ, *tendering* Christ's body to the receiver. That this is his true sense is evident not only (1) from his own explanations, but (2) from his clear teaching concerning the real body of Christ, which (with our Reformers) he held (*a*) to be circumscribed by the limits of a true body, and (*b*) to be therefore restrained from any such real presence as was required by the Romish Transubstantiation or the Lutheran Consubstantiation. The reader who may desire evidence on this point, will be fully satisfied (I believe) by what Dean Goode has adduced on this point. (On Eucharist, vol. ii., pp. 904-908.)

But,

II. I must observe also, that the date of Thorndike's writings is far beyond the limits specified. We are dealing here with the theological language of our Articles, and the theological language of the Reformation. And it is of the Reformation period, that I ask the question:—CAN ANYTHING BE FOUND IN THE WRITINGS OF THE TIME, AND IN THE WRITINGS OF OUR ENGLISH REFORMERS, TO WARRANT SUCH A DISTINCTION BETWEEN EATING AND RECEIVING?

And further, this question is asked concerning the language of *English* Theology, and the writings of *English* Reforming divines. It is quite true that such a distinction comes into the subtleties with which Bucer found himself constrained to defend the language which he had used and maintained in his earnest desire to effect a concord between the Lutherans and the Reformed. (See below, p. 480, sqq.) His words are "Qui credunt, nec tamen recte dejudicant hunc cibum (ut Corinthii quidam ab Apostolo culpantur) ut hos non possim negare, Christum fide, quam habent, in Cœna *percipere*: Ita non dixerim eos

Christum *manducare*, postquam fidem non ritè hic exercent suam, religiosa tantorum mysteriorum dijudicatione, quæ est spiritualis cibi hujus manducatio." (See "Consensus Orthodoxus," p. 321; Zurich, 1605.) It is to be well observed, however, that in using such language Bucer carefully distinguishes the *indigni* from the *impii*, and that what is said here is said of the *indigni* in Bucer's classification, not of the *impii* of our Article. "Ne tamen," he says, "aliquid concederemus, unde occasionem quispiam posset arripere statuendi vel dicendi, corpus Domini cum pane ita uniri, ut quisquis panem manducet, idem etiam corpus domini *manducet*, sive credat, sive non credat, sive etiam Turca sit vel Ethnicus, aut alius hujus actionis perversor, et Domini irrisor: Ideo non permisimus in articulo poni *incredulos*, vel *impios*, sed *indignos*, eosque tales, de quibus Apostolus Paulus scribit, quod in Ecclesia adhuc tolerari debeant." (Ibid. p. 385.)

I do not say that Bucer's distinctions may not have found some place in Geste's mind, for he appears to me (see below, Note E) to give some indications of having been brought under the influence of his teaching. Yet I do not think that I have seen any evidence of any such distinction finding a place in the writings of our English Reformers. Nor do I think that the circumstances of the case will afford any support to the hypothesis of any such distinction finding a place in our Article.

In Bradford's case we see the synonymous use of "to eat" and "to receive." (See his Works, Sermons, etc., P. S. Edit.; pp. 91, 456, 489, 490, 511, 542, 585.) And compare Philpot's Examinations, where (p. 133) the Romanist Chedsay says, "I will prove that the evil and wicked men *EAT* the body of Christ," in support of his assertion that "evil men *RECEIVE* Christ." See also Cranmer "On Lord's Supper," where (pp. 201, 214, 217, 219, 222, 225) Gardiner speaks of "receiving" and "eating" without any distinction.

Cranmer knows no distinction between "eating" and "receiving." (See e.g. "On Lord's Supper," pp. 203, 204, 207, and especially 218.) Neither does Latimer (see Sermons, pp. 458, 459); nor Ridley (see Works, pp. 248, 199, 12); nor Hutchinson (Works, pp. 262, 263); nor Redmayne (see above, pp. 424, 425); nor Rogers (see above, pp. 421, 422).

It will be seen also that in the conference with Campion the Jesuit (1581), Fulke proves "He is not *received* of the wicked" from Augustine's words—"Nec dicendi sunt *manducare corpus*," of which words Campion says, "His meaning is, They *receive* not the grace of Christ effectually to salvation"; and Fulke answers, "His words are, They *receive* not the body, etc." Again, after Fulke had said, "He saith expressly they *eat* not the body, etc.," Campion declares "They *receive* Christ, but not worthily." Again, a little further on, Campion says, "They *eat* Christ sacramentally." Fulke answers, "Yea, but not in deed, as St. Augustine saith." Then Campion replies, "They *receive* the same Christ, but not the same comfort." Which again is expressed, almost immediately after-

wards, thus, "The wicked *eat* the same body, but not to the same effect." (See "True Report of the Disputation, etc," Third day's Conference; Argument 9; London, 1583.)

It is true indeed, that Geste speaks of the title of the Article he deprecates, as containing the words, "do not *receive*."¹ But there seems to be no room for the supposition that a change from "*receive*" to "*eat*" was made by the Convocation, as if *declining* to say "the wicked do not RECEIVE," but *desiring* to say "they do not EAT" in the sense of "FRUITFULLY RECEIVE" (see Perry, on "Declaration concerning Kneeling," p. 207), for Geste professes to be citing (as I understand him) from the draft of the Articles as signed by the Bishops in 1562.

Let Geste's words be well marked. He speaks of "the first copy of the Book of Articles." It is a copy which *had been subscribed* by "the most part of the bishops." It is a copy which has an article which "is not in the printed books, either in Latin or English." Is there any reasonable room for question that Geste is referring to the Articles of 1562, which after being signed by most of the bishops (though not, as would appear, by Geste and Cheney), had this article struck out before being printed? [In the copy of Articles in the Record Office, State Papers, Elizabeth; Domestic, vol. xxvii. 40, there is a note written in the margin of the Article. "This is *the original*, but *not printed*."] This Article *then* (1562) had *not* been authorized by the queen. Geste is alarmed now at Parker's purpose to present to the queen "the *first copy*" *with* this Article. In his alarm he writes to Cecil, lest now it should, through Parker's "purpose," be "confirmed and authorized by the queen's grace."

It may be observed also that when the Articles were published in 1571 (with the 29th Article) they were published (as they have been since) not as "Articles agreed upon in 1571," but as "Articles whereupon it was agreed . . . in the Convocation holden at London, in the year of our Lord God 1562." Now, if this was the design (simply to enforce the Articles of 1562 in their *entirety*, as they had come from the Convocation), how very unlikely it is that Parker should have been framing for insertion anything like a new Article, instead of the one already standing in the "first copy," to which "the most part of the bishops" had already subscribed! Besides which, would not Mr. Grueber's theory require him to suppose that Parker (who in *his* view was *very favourable* to the Lutherans) prepared for the Convocation a draft of the Articles, in which the 29th was, not only so worded as purposely to exclude Lutheran views, but *altered for that very purpose* from the Article already signed in 1562; and then, in Convocation was compelled to alter it, so as to admit Lutheran views, and that by those, the majority of whom will, I suppose, be admitted to have been decidedly Anti-Lutheran?

¹ It may be observed that another of Geste's quotations is not *verbally* accurate. Geste writes—"It is further saied after a spirituall and heavenly maner onely." The words of the Article in the English version of 1563 were (as indeed Geste had previously cited them) "after an heavenly and spirituall maner onely."

When, therefore, Geste says, "And *there* in this Article," I submit that he can hardly be understood as referring to anything but "the first copy" of 1562.

Now I have examined the MS. copy of the 39 Articles of the Convocation of 1562 [among the State Papers, Elizabeth ; Domestic, vol. xxvii. 40. Original draft (probably) and 41 Fair Copy], and THERE is indeed the 29th Article, but the title is nearly the same as we have it now—"The wicked do not eate the Bodie of Christe in the use of the Lord's Supper." It has the word "eat," not the word "receive." (See Swainson's Essay on Art. 29, p. 32.)

So also the title of the MS. copy of the Latin Articles of 1562 (containing Archbishop Parker's markings, and the autograph signatures of the archbishops and bishops, and preserved in Corpus Christi Coll., Cambridge) is this:—"Impii non manducant Corpus Christi in usu cœnæ." (See Lamb's "Historical account of the Thirty-nine Articles," copy No. ii, p. 13, and Preface, p. iii. Also Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. i., pp. 35-39, note.) Therefore Geste's citing the title as saying, "*do not receive*," can only, I think, be taken as additional evidence of the indiscriminate use of the two expressions, ("to eat," and "to receive,") as applied to this subject.

To this it is to be added, that the preceding Article asserts that FAITH is "the mean whereby the body and blood of Christ are" not only *eaten*, but "RECEIVED AND eaten;" whence the natural inference would be, that as without THE MEAN there could be NO EATING, so without THE MEAN there could be NO RECEIVING for the faithless. And indeed, it may be noted, that in this same letter Geste aims at establishing his assertion concerning "*receiving*" by what St. Paul says concerning "*eating*," and by the words of our Lord, "Take, eat."

Note C, p. 416.

Any one really desirous of knowing whether the new interpretation will stand, must feel the importance of the enquiry whether the *eating and drinking* of the "res sacramenti" by the unfaithful was or was not a *moot question* at that date. If it *was*, then there can be no doubt whatever, from the title of the Article, that the Article itself was intended to speak, and does speak to *that* question.

That it was a moot question the extracts from our Reformers' writings can leave no doubt whatever.

That it was felt in the Eucharistic Controversy to be a *most important* question, and was sometimes applied as *the testing* question on the subject of the Presence (both at home and abroad) the following quotations may be taken in evidence—

I. The first is from Cranmer's Book on the Lord's Supper, and is adduced to shew how important a place this question occupies in the matters which Cranmer sets before him to treat of in his great work.

"This therefore shall be mine issue: that as no scripture, so no ancient author known and approved, hath in plain terms your tran-

substantiation: nor that the body and blood of Christ be really, corporally, naturally, and carnally under the forms of bread and wine: nor that evil men do eat the very body and drink the very blood of Christ: nor that Christ is offered every day by the priest a sacrifice propitiatory for sins." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 13.)

In the section indeed "of the eating and drinking" which forms a considerable part of his book, Cranmer teaches that "though Christ were corporally in the Sacrament," "He cannot be corporally eaten" (p. 203), but this does not take away from the truth of the really testing character of this question, as a matter of fact, in its application to the controversies of the day. Those who held the Corporal Presence, did hold also that the *res sacramenti* was (in some sense) corporally eaten.

II. The second is from Bradford's last examination. It is alleged to show how this question was applied as a test to one who when asked "Didst thou not deny Christ's presence in the Sacrament?" had truly answered "No," though he denied the inclusion of Christ in the bread.

"If He be not included," quoth the bishop of Worcester, "how is He then present?" "Forsooth, quoth Bradford, my faith knoweth how, though my tongue cannot express it, nor you otherwise than by faith hear it, or understand it." "Here was much ado now, one doctor starting up and speaking this, another that, and the lord chancellor talking much of Luther, Zuinglius, and Œcolampadius: but still Bradford kept them at this point that Christ is present to faith, and that there is no transubstantiation: nor including of Christ in the bread: but all this would not serve them. Therefore another bishop asked THIS question, *whether the wicked man received Christ's very body or no?* And Bradford answered plainly, 'No.' Whereat the lord chancellor made a long oration how that it *could not be* that Christ was *present*, except that the *evil man* receive Him." (Bradford's Works, i., pp. 488-9. See also pp. 511 and 531.)

III. The third is from Philpot's examinations, and shows how the same question was applied as a test in his case also by one who said "These say you do confess a real presence; but I will be hanged if you will abide by it: you will deny it by and by."

Chedsey:—"If there be a *real presence* in the sacrament, then *evil men receive Christ*: which thing you *will not grant* I am sure."

Philpot:—"I deny the argument; for I do not grant in the sacrament by transubstantiation any real presence, as you falsely imagine, but in the due administration to the worthy receivers."

Chedsey:—"I will prove that the evil and wicked men eat of the body of Christ, as well as the good men, by St. Austin here." (Philpot's Examinations, p. 133.)

IV. The fourth is from the letter of Hierome Zanchius to Bishop Grindal, dated at Strassburg, before Aug. 23, 1563 (given in Zurich

Letters, P. S. Edit., ii., p. 98, sqq.). The occasion is thus stated by Strype (Grindal, p. 75):

“Hierom Zanchy, an Italian by birth, was now public reader of divinity at Strasburgh: with him Grindal was acquainted ever since himself lived there, and since his departure kept a correspondence with him. This year letters happened between them upon this occasion. The Augustan Confession about this time began to be pressed vigorously, and particularly in the said town of Strasburgh, upon all the reformed there, or no abiding for them. This was the cause of great contests and debates between the learned Lutherans in the school there, and Zanchy, who in the matter of the sacrament, and predestination, and some other things, could not accord with their Confession. But at last for peace sake, this year, the difference was composed, and he did subscribe (yet with some exceptions and conditions in these words, *Hanc doctrinæ formulam ut piam agnosco: ita etiam recipio ego Hieronymus Zanchius*). This being so large a concession to the Lutheran doctrine, he saw, might justly make the reformed in other parts to wonder at his subscription.” (See Grindal’s Remains, p. 277.)

The letter shows how Zanchius and the Lutherans could come to a verbal agreement, Zanchius allowing in some sense all the doctrinal statements submitted to him, until the question of the reception by the unworthy is found to be the application of a test, which brings out the real disagreement.

The following is the conclusion of that part of the letter which relates the conference on this subject:

“Here James Andreas exclaims with astonishment, ‘Truly then you hold the same opinion as we do.’ . . . ‘If it is also yours, I rejoice for myself, and congratulate you and the Church.’ ‘Now,’ says he, ‘I see why you have brought so many arguments (namely in my confession) against our statement that the Body of Christ is also eaten with the bodily mouth, because you suppose that we hold the body of Christ to be eaten with the mouth of our body, as if the body of Christ were in contact with our mouth and body.’ ‘Just so,’ I replied, ‘I supposed from your writings that such was your opinion.’ ‘By no means,’ said he, ‘by no means do we entertain this view, but only express ourselves in this way by reason of the sacramental union.’ I then said, ‘If these are your sentiments, I do not find fault with that expression, for I also admit, that on account of the sacramental union there is attributed to the body of Christ what is the property of bread, and on the other hand, to bread, what belongs to the body of Christ.’ ‘But what,’ says he, ‘do you think of the EATING OF THE UNWORTHY?’ ‘If by this term,’ I answered, ‘you mean men who are clearly ungodly and destitute of true faith, I cannot admit that the body of Christ is eaten by such persons. But if you mean such persons as are endued with faith, albeit a weak one, and of a more relaxed life than is becoming to a Christian, I do not deny it; for such were those Corinthians who, because they had eaten the body of the Lord unworthily, St. Paul says, were judged, that is, were

chastened of the Lord, that they should not be condemned with the world.' We could not therefore agree about this Article. 'But I have no doubt,' he said, 'that if you will more diligently examine this Article, you will come over to our sentiments.' 'I have already,' I replied, 'examined it with sufficient attention, and am unable to think otherwise than as I do.' 'Well,' says he, 'we have said enough upon the supper.'" (Letter of Hierome Zanchius to Grindal, Aug. 23, 1563, in Zurich Letters, ii., p. 101.)

V. Hence we find the early endeavours for reconciliation obliged to aim at leaving this one question untouched.

"A. 1531. In controversia . . . de cœna Domini id potissimum a Bucero, qui conciliatoris partes sumpserat, postulabat, ut præsentia Christi in signis corporalibus agnosceretur; volebat interim tunc quæstionem, *an impii etiam corpus Domini sumerent, suspendi.*" (Seckendorf, Historia Lutheranismi. Lib. iii., sect. iii., § 7.)

VI. Hence also we find Luther, when, after writing against the Mass, he had been supposed to have changed his view of the Real Presence, publishing a letter on the subject (1534), in which, after declaring that the body of Christ is received "a communicantibus sub panis elemento;" he says "Accipitur autem hoc corpus et hic sanguis *non solum a sanctis et dignis, sed a peccatoribus et indignis*, vere et corporaliter, licit invisibiliter, manu, ore, etc." (See Seckendorf, Historia Lutheranismi. Lib. iii., sect. 8, § xxvii.)

VII. Hence also, in 1536, when Bucer came to negotiate with Luther for a reconciliation with the Reformed, Luther, we are told, "ex ardore suo nihil remittens, postulabat revocationem eorum, quæ de figurato verborum Christi in cœnæ institutione intellectu docuissent, et ut eadem, quæ ipse, profiterentur"—and demanded "ut cogitarent, et sequenti die renunciarent, quid sentirent;"—we are told "Die itaque 24 Maii. . . . Bucerus confessus est, se aliter quædam intellexisse, neque satis probata docuisse, revocaturum se illa ore et scripto, quovis modo. Dein . . . profitebatur panem verum esse corpus Christi . . . vere etiam sumi corpus Christi . . . non tantum corde, sed etiam ore sumentium, a *dignis ad salutem, ab indignis ad judicium.*"

After this, we are told Luther was satisfied, and a reconciliation effected. But then "Jussi sunt sententiam priorem aliorum cordibus eximere, et hanc, quam professi nunc essent, docere, aut si rudi populo durum videretur, si diceretur, *impios corpus Domini sumere*, verbis Pauli uti, qui *indignos* nominat." (See Seckendorf, Historia Lutheranismi. Lib. iii., sect. 15, § xlvii.)

VIII. Further important evidence to the same effect will be found in the following extract from Seckendorf. 1539, "Recruduerat inter illum [*Johannem Forsterum*] et *Michaelem Cellarium* rixa de quæstione Sacramentaria, quæ concordia Wittembergensi anno 1536, et speci-

atim Augustæ penitus sopita videbatur: Forsterus nihilominus Cellarium Zuinglianismi suspectum habebat, ejusque mentem propositis quæstionibus penetrare tentaverat, inter quas erat, *an indigni vere et substantialiter sumant corpus et sanguinem Domini?* quam omnes, qui præsentiam non nisi fide assequendam statuunt, negare compelluntur. Cellarius non solum silentio eum evitaverat, sed et Forsterum apud Magistratum detulerat." (Seckendorf, *Historia Lutheranismi*. Lib. iii., sect. 18, § lxviii., 35.)

IX. Hence we find this question being dealt with in Reformed Confessions of faith. It was not the Church of England alone which desired, by speaking to this testing question, to give distinctness to the statements on Eucharistic doctrine.

(1) Thus speaks (1566) the latter Confession of Helvetia (with which Grindal declared to Bullinger our entire agreement), "As for him that without faith cometh to this holy Table of the Lord he is made partaker of the Sacrament only; but the matter of the Sacrament, from whence cometh life and salvation, he receiveth not at all." (Hall's Harmony, p. 319.)

(2) And so the Confession of Belgia (1566), agreed to by the English delegates at Dort, declares, "An evil man verily receiveth the Sacrament to his own condemnation; but the thing or truth of the Sacrament he receiveth not. As, for example, Judas, and Simon Magnus, did both of them receive the Sacrament sign; but as for Christ himself, signified thereby, they received Him not. For Christ is communicated to the faithful only." (Hall's Harmony, p. 337.)

(3) So the Westminster Confession, "Although ignorant and wicked men receive the outward Elements in this Sacrament; yet they receive not the thing signified thereby: but by their unworthy coming thereunto are guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord to their own damnation." (Edit. 1658, p. 100.)

X. On the other hand, before our Church rejected the Corporal Presence the same testing question was dealt with, and had given to it an opposite answer.

(1) Thus the Ten Articles of 1536 declare "that, under the same form and figure of bread and wine, the very self-same body and blood of Christ is corporally, really, and in very substance, *exhibited, distributed, and received unto and of ALL THEM which receive the said Sacrament.*"

(2) And the Articles of 1538 teach "quod sub eisdem speciebus vere et realiter exhibentur et distribuuntur illis qui Sacramentum accipiunt, *sive bonis, sive malis.*"¹ (See Dr. Heurtley's "Remarks on Declaration," pp. 7, 8; and Hardwick on Articles, p. 265.)

¹ So also in the Confession of Dositheus (drawn up at the Synod of Jerusalem, 1672,) it is declared—"Εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ πανακήρατον τοῦ Κυρίου σῶμα καὶ αἷμα μεταδίδοσθαι καὶ εἰσδύειν εἰς τὸ στόμα καὶ στόμαχον τῶν μετεχόντων εὐσεβῶν τε καὶ ἀσεβῶν." (See Kimmel's "Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiæ Orientalis," p. 458, Jenæ, 1850.)

XI. Hence we find Bellarmine saying of the Reformed “Ex hoc sequitur Sextum eorum pronunciatum, quo asserunt homines improbos non percipere Corpus Christi, licet symbola percipiant.” (De Eucharistiâ, lib. i., cap. i.)

XII. If further evidence yet be desired of the testing character of this question, as felt and understood at the time of the Reformation, the reader may be referred to Beza's Tractationes Theol., especially the following pages, with their contexts :—Vol. i., pp. 228, 248, 287, 573, 621 ; vol. ii., pp. 131, 143, 173. Edit. 1582.

One quotation only is here given—“HESHIUS [Lutheran]. Ipsi etiam increduli, impii, et damnati, vescuntur carne Christi : ergo necesse est aliquem esse carnis esum corporalem tam piis quam impiis communem, qui distinguitur a spirituali, in quo videlicet percipitur ipsa vita. THEOPHILUS. Quid si tibi hoc concedam ? HES. Nempe noster eris.” (Beza, Tract. Theol. Genev. 1582, vol. i., p. 287.)

XIII. Further evidence arises from the Smalkaldic Articles, which constituted a stricter test of Lutheran doctrine, than the Augustan Confession supplied.

Here it is declared, “De Sacramento altaris sentimus, panem et vinum in Cœna esse verum corpus et sanguinem Christi : et scimus hæc porrigi et accipi non tantum a bonis, verum etiam a malis Christianis.” (See Hospinian, 1537, vol. iv., pp. 273, 274.)

In this connexion let the reader mark the following—“Forma Sacramenti consistit in δόσει et λήψει, quam designat Aæ Confess. distributione et perceptione corporis et sanguinis Domini, quod ita declarat Apologia, quod corpus et sanguis Domini verè exhibeantur cum illis rebus, quæ videntur, pane et vino, his qui Sacramentum accipiunt ; UNDE RESULTAT id, quod disertè proponunt art. Smalcald., p. 3, art. 6. Verum corpus et sanguinem Christi in Cœnâ non tantum dari et sumi a piis, sed etiam ab impiis Christianis.” (Calov. Exegema Augustanæ Confessionis. Witteberg., 1665, art. x., sect. 7.)

XIV. Peter Martyr, speaking of the Lutherans and their views, had taught at Oxford, in Edward's reign, “Alterum vero, nimirum quod etiam impiis detur Corpus Christi, vident necessario consequi : sed . . . efficacibus rationibus probatum est, impios tantum sumere externa elementa.” (Loci Communes, vol. i., p. 1616. Basle, 1580.)

XV. I add in evidence, that Ursinus, in his Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism, gives at the conclusion a statement of matters of agreement and disagreement in the Eucharistic controversy between “the churches which profess the Gospel.” And he states the matters of dissent as three. The two first are (in short) these :—1. The one part will understand the words “This is my body” as they sound. 2. The one part will have the body to be essentially in or with the bread. The third is given thus—“3. The one part will have all, whosoever come to the table of the Lord's Supper, and eat and drink that bread

and wine, whether they be *believers* or *unbelievers*, to eat and drink, corporally and with their bodily mouth, the flesh and blood of Christ, believers to life and salvation, unbelievers to damnation and death; the other holdeth, that unbelievers abuse indeed the outward signs, bread and wine, to their damnation, but that the *faithful only* can eat and drink, by a true *faith*, and the fore-alleged working of the Holy Ghost, the body and blood of Christ unto eternal life." (Page 480. See quotation in Newin's "Mystical Presence," p. 93.)

Again, in the Appendix, Ursinus gives a brief summary of objections made by "Con-substantiaries" against the "sincere doctrine of the Lord's Supper" as held by those called "Sacramentaries." From these I extract the following Objection and Answer:—

"4th Obj. The Sacramentaries affirm that the true body of Christ, which hung on the cross, and His very blood which was shed for us, is *distributed* and is *spiritually received* of those who are *worthy receivers*; as for the *unworthy*, they *receive nothing* besides the *bare signs*, to their own condemnation.

"Ans. All this we grant, as being agreeable to the Word of God, the nature of Sacraments, the analogy of faith, and the communion of the faithful." (Page 472. English Trans. See quotation in Newin's "Mystical Presence," p. 92.)

XVI. Yet further I add, in evidence, the following extract from Bucer's Letter to Pontanus, 1530, "Pro vero affirmare non dubito, Controversiam inter Lutherum et Zuinglium et Œcolampadium, quantum ego intelligo, in tribus consistere punctis:

"*Quomodo scilicet verba illa: Hoc est corpus meum, sint intelligenda?*

"*Quomodo homines Corpus Christi comedant?*

"*Qui illud accipiant?*" (See Hospinian, *Historia Sacramentaria*, part ii., 1530; in Works, vol. iv., p. 178. Geneva, 1681.)

When he comes to write on the third point he commences by saying, "Tertio, de illo etiam controvertitur, *an impii Corpus Christi percipiant?*" (Page 180.)

XVII. Again, the ministers of Augsburg, declaring their matters of dissent from Luther, say, "Item . . . colligimus . . . verum corpus et sanguinem Domini *neminem* accipere, *qui non verè* in Christum *credat*, ejusque membrum sit . . . In hac certè actione *incredulis nihil præter Sacramenta* concedere possumus, non vero ipsam Christi Domini manducationem, ut quæ semper vitam æternam conferat." (See Hospinian, *Historia Sacramentaria*, part ii., 1533; in Works, vol. iv., p. 216. Geneva, 1681.)

And again, "Concedere non possumus, Christum Dominum nostrum cibum . . . verè et per sese à quoquam sine fide accipi et manducari." (Ibid. p. 218.)

And again, "Cum hanc actionem ad infideles minime pertinentem, solis credentibus relinquimus: Lutherus ita interdum loquitur, ut

actionem hanc etiam cum incredulis communem facere velle videatur." (Ibid. p. 239.)

XVIII. This also may be added from a letter of Luther himself : "Si Argentinenses animum obfirmârunt, ut nobiscum sentire et credere nolint, corpus et sanguinem Christi etiam externè in pane et vino adesse, et a *piis pariter ac impiis porrigi, tractari, et accipi*; maturè omni conciliationis labore et molestiâ supersedere poterant." (See Hospinian, *Historia Sacramentaria*, Part ii., 1531; in *Works*, vol. iv., p. 205; Geneva, 1681.)

And this from another letter of Luther :—"Cum ipso [Bucero] (Coburgæ) agebam de illa corporali præsentia, quâ utrique, *tam infideles quam fideles*, etiam ore verum corpus et verum sanguinem Christi, sub pane et vino accipiunt." (Ibid. p. 205.)

XIX. Yet again, we are told that three questions were propounded to Peucer. 1st. Concerning the omnipotence of Christ's humanity. 2nd. Concerning the presence of Christ's body at the same time in heaven and on earth. 3rd. "*Tertia quæstio fuit*: An credat Peucerus, quòd Christi Corpus ore in Cœna sacra accipiatur ab *omnibus* qui accedunt, sive fidem veram habeant, sive non?" (See Hospinian, "De Origine et prog. Libri Concord.," in *Works*, vol. v., p. 343; Geneva, 1678.)

XX. Further evidence is furnished by the "Harmonia Confessionum," which (failing the project of one common Confession for the Reformed Churches) was drawn up, at the suggestion of the Protestants of Zurich and Geneva, under the auspices of Beza, Daneau, and Salar; chiefly, it is said, by the hand of Salar. (See Hall's *Introduction to Harmony*, pp. xi., xii.) This was first published in Latin, in 1581, at Geneva.

The Preface, dwelling on the agreement of Protestant Confessions, thus speaks of the matter of the Eucharistic controversy with the Lutherans :—"Sed hæc superest quæstio, an ut signum sic etiam res ipsa præsens corpori, an verò potius signum quidem præsens corpori, res autem præsens duntaxat menti et fidei præbeatur. Item an sicut quibusvis utrumque præbetur, sic a quibusvis utrumque sumatur, ab aliis quidem ad vitam, ab aliis vero ad mortem." ("Harmonia Confessionum," Præfatio; Geneva, 1581.)

Truth, however, requires it, I think, to be frankly acknowledged, that one¹ remarkable case, in particular (to which some of the above

¹ Another exception would have to be made in the case of the *Repetitio Anhaltina* (see Niemeyer's *Collectio Confessionum*, p. 628), if it were indeed a *Reformed* Confession.

But it will be found that in the Preface is contained an unqualified profession of adherence to Luther and Lutheran doctrine (see Niemeyer, p. 616; which, however, is not to be understood as an unconditional acceptance of *everything* that Luther had written—see Hospinian, *Works*, vol. v., pp. 139 b, 140 a; Geneva,

extracts have reference) may quite fairly be alleged as seeming to tell on the other side. It was the case of the *Concordia Witebergensis* (1536), in which Bucer (who had been identified with the Reformed) allowed language concerning the case of the unworthy receivers, with which Luther was brought (for concord's sake) to express himself satisfied.

But then it must be remembered—(1) that this *Concord* belongs to the comparatively early history of the controversy; (2) that in the first stage of this history, opinions on both sides appear to have been taking shape and *hardening*, rather than to have had already their sharp points fixed (witness, e.g., the *Syngramma Suevicum* attacking positions, as of Œcolampadius, which the Swiss afterwards repudiated; and standing, as on Luther's side, upon ground which, in part, was found afterwards to belong to the Reformed rather than to Luther); (3) that Luther's earlier views appear to have been fluctuating, or uncertain, or inconsistent—perhaps some will think they never ceased to be self-contradictory; (4) that Bucer's intense desire (for the sake of which labour and toil and pains were to him as nothing) was to be a peacemaker between the two parties who, agreeing in the faith of the Gospel, were becoming separated (to the joy

1678); and there is nothing in its declarations concerning the Eucharist at variance with this profession.

I suppose the reason of its being printed by Niemeyer among the Confessions of the *Reformed*, must have been its distinct rejection of *Ubiquity*, against which its teaching is chiefly directed.

But the doctrine of *Ubiquity* was not persistently held or taught by Luther himself. (See Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. iii., p. 347, note; Edit. Soames. And Horneck's "Crucified Jesus," pp. 140, 141; London, 1727.)

Even when Ultra-Lutheranism had developed itself in the *Formula Concordiæ*, and therein had stamped upon itself (in some degree) the character of *Ubiquity*, there were still some Lutherans who stood apart. (See Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. iii., p. 346.)

And though the prominent upholders of the *Formula* maintained that the doctrine of *Ubiquity* was essential to the Lutheran doctrine of the Presence (see Hospinian, vol. v., pp. 225 a, 227 a, 228 a), yet this *dictum* did not meet with universal acceptance among Lutherans. (See Hospinian, vol. v., p. 225 a, etc., etc.)

Doubtless the tendency of such a falling away of the Anhalt Theologians (and of other Lutherans also) from the later definitions of Lutheran doctrine (concerning the Person of Christ), was to draw them towards the Reformed: and it was not an unnatural result, that subsequently (1595) the Lutheran worship was found in Anhalt to give place (for the most part) to the worship of the Reformed. (See Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. iii., p. 385, and note 3; Edit. Soames, 1845.)

But at the date of the drawing-up of the *Repetitio* (1579—see Niemeyer, 612; Hospinian, v., 264 a) I believe it will be found that, while rejecting the *Ubiquity* of more recent Lutheranism, the theologians of Anhalt were as yet clinging to the *Consubstantiation* of Luther.

Indeed, shortly before this (1578) we find the Lutheran *Musculus* stigmatizing them as a new sort of *Sacramentaries*, who denied *Ubiquity*, but held the doctrine of the Presence (*qui præsentiam credunt, et Ubiquitatem negant*). (See Hospinian, vol. v., p. 225 a. See also pp. 140 a, 225 b, 227 a, 228 a.)

Not only so, but we find them expressing a general concurrence with the teaching of the *Formula Concordiæ*, so far as relates to the Lord's Supper. (See Hospinian, vol. v., p. 139 b.)

of the Papists) on the doctrine of the Eucharist (see Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., Edit. Soames, vol. iii., pp. 355, 361, 359, 117, 118, 119; Gorham's Reformation Gleanings, pp. 84, 86, 91); (5) that in this longing for peace he was brought to persuade himself, (a) that what sounded amiss in Luther's sayings ought fairly to be interpreted by his other sayings, and might thus be deprived of every objectionable sense (see Gorham's Reformation Gleanings, pp. 105, 106), and (b) that thus the separation between the parties was made and kept up by human heart-burnings and verbal disagreements, rather than any real doctrinal difference; (6) that Bucer found that all his labours for peace would prove vain, unless some concession were made as to the language of the Reformed concerning reception by the unworthy; (7) that though thus he was brought to use (and subsequently to defend) language on the subject which had a certain Lutheran sound, he used it not in the full Lutheran sense—(see Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 253 b); (8) that notwithstanding all his explanations, the esteem in which he was so justly held could not hinder the growth of a certain suspicion and shyness (to say the least) towards him on the part of the Reformed (see Gorham's Reformation Gleanings, pp. 57, 72, 106, 108); (9) that here in England, honoured as he was, his quasi-Lutheran language (to say the least) was felt to be indefensible, and somewhat to hamper our Reformers in their controversy with Papists (see Cranmer on Lord's Supper, pp. 19, 21, 90, 91, 126, 223, 224, 225; Jewel, Sermon and Harding, pp. 468, 469, 498, 499; Original Letters, pp. 61, 544, 675, 678, 572, 652, 666, 662, 545, 696, 697; Jenkyns's Cranmer, vol. iv., p. 41; Hardwick's Reformation, p. 166 note, 220, 221, and notes); (10) that after all, the *Concordia Witebergensis* was found to be but the slender bridge of a verbal agreement thrown over a real doctrinal chasm—a bridge which may, indeed, have helped some to pass over to real Lutheran views, but one which was quite unable to unite the separated doctrines, and which very soon broke down and was swept away altogether; that therefore, giving all honour to Bucer, as a “peacemaker,” we can hardly do otherwise than acknowledge that his labour for reconciliation made him somewhat blind to some of the aspects of the question; (11) that time,¹ as it brought out more

¹ How entirely the Lutherans themselves subsequently repudiated Bucer's subtle distinctions (those on which the *Concordia Witebergensis* rested), is plain from the “Formula Concordiæ,” in which it is said—“Credimus, docemus, et confitemur, unum tantum genus esse indignorum convivarum, ii sunt soli illi, qui non credunt.” And again—“Credimus, docemus, et confitemur, quod nullus vere creditum, quam diu vivam fidem retinet, sacram Domini cœnam ad iudicium sumat, quantacunque fidei imbecillitate laboret.” (“De Cœna Domini” *affirmativa*, Nos. viii. and ix., p. 601 of “Concordia, pia et unanimes Consensu,” etc.)

How completely, also, Bucer's *Concordia* failed of finding acceptance among the Reformed, may be gathered from the following Lutheran testimony:—“Hoc nimirum, volunt, Corpus Christi cum pane sacramentaliter se significative unitum esse: ita ut credentes et pii homines tam certo Corpus Christi (quod sursum in cœlis sit) fide spiritualiter accipiant, quam certo panem ore manducant. Quod vero Corpus Christi in sacra Cœna in his terris substantialiter (licet invisibili et incompre-

clearly the real merits and points of the controversy, made it to be more and more apparent that a real and insuperable doctrinal difference existed, and that a crucial test of the difference was to be found in the question of the reception by such as be void of a lively faith.

If these things are well considered, I question whether this exceptional case will not be found to strengthen rather than to weaken the force of my argument. If, however, in this my own opinion should be warped by prejudice, or the reader should think it so to be, I will ask the reader to look carefully into the history of the matter; marking especially—(1) Luther's positive demand (though it is true he was brought to accept something less) as the necessary condition of peace,—“*ut auditoribus suis probe inculcarent, quod in Cœna vere habeatur et accipiatur verum corpus et sanguis Christi: idque non minus ab impiis quam a piis*” (see Hospinian, p. 246 a). (2) Bucer's expressed feeling (and that of his associates) concerning this: “*Multa et gravia se præbituros scandala ecclesiis suis, si dicerent, Impios æquè participes fieri corporis Domini, ac pios,*” (p. 246 b); again—“*Auditum horribilem vocem in Ecclesiis suis faturam, si dicatur: Impios æquè corpus Christi manducare ac pios.*” (Ibid.) (3) How the Swiss, in accepting the “Concord,” muffle the sound of the part pertaining to this point, and pass on hastily. (See p. 286 b.)

After carefully weighing this, I will then ask the reader to make, in consequence, what deductions he thinks right from the value of the testimonies I have here adduced.

There is one thing however (and a most important one) which the reader must, in fairness, be asked to consider well, and take into calculation, in his endeavour to arrive at the truth of this matter. It is this—that in the matter of the manducation of the *res sacramenti* by the *infideles*, it is one thing for Bucer and some of the Reformed, to have approximated in their language to the language of Luther's *affirmative*. It is quite another thing for Luther and the real Lutherans in doctrine, so to have approximated in their language to the Reformed as to lay aside their positive *affirmative* and change it into the direct *negative*. Bucer, in his desire for peace, did affirm that the *indigni* (not the *impii*) receive. But did Luther, or any of the Lutherans, ever deny that the *impii* eat? Did they ever declare that such “in no wise are partakers of Christ”?

It is true that Luther, for peace sake, was brought to concede something of his demands,¹ and to be satisfied with Bucer's dictum—

hensibili modo) præsens sit, et una cum pane benedicto, ore, etiam ab hypocritis et nomine duntaxat Christianis, sumatur, id solent quasi horrendam blasphemiam damnare et execrari.” (*Formula Concordiæ*, under “*Solida et uberior repetitio*,” vii., “*De Cœna Domini*,” in “*Concordia*,” Lipsiæ, 1654, pp. 727, 728.)

¹ Even after Luther's concession, Bucer evidently felt the difficulty of reconciling what he had conceded with the views of the Reformed. His words, when commending the *Concordia* at Strasburg, were “*Alterum, indignis porrigi etiam cum pane Corpus Domini, et sumi hoc ab eis, positum est propter verba Pauli 1 Cor. xi., qui scribit, Indigne sumentes reos fieri corporis et sanguinis Domini.*” (See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 253, b.)

There were those among our English Reformers who would have been ready to

"Indignos Corpus Domini sumere." (See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 248, a.) But that was obviously very different from admitting the negation of his own *dictum*—"non minus ab impiis quàm a piis." (See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 246, a.)

It is true also that Luther assented to the former Helvetic Confession. But that assent was modified by expressions of some sort of dissatisfaction. (See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 276, a; also pp. 277, 278.)

And the question is dealt with in *that* Confession, not by any means in the distinct manner in which it is treated in the latter Confession of Helvetia, and in our own Articles.

Indeed the former Confession of Helvetia was designedly drawn up with a view to meet the requirements of the Lutherans. (See Niemeyer's *Collectio Confessionum*, Preface, pp. 33-35.) And the concessions made to the pacificators (Bucer and Capito) gave rise to some subsequent dissatisfaction, especially in respect of the Latin version. (See Niemeyer, p. 35.)

But unless it can be shown that the Lutherans *did* (after this controversy had taken shape) admit the language of *negation* in this matter, the force of the argument from the testing character of this question, is left untouched, so far as our Article is concerned, by the example of Bucer. Bucer's example will prove, indeed, that the test was not perfect on the Lutheran side, inasmuch as modified Lutheran statements of the affirmative might sometimes be accepted by, and thus not be exclusive of the Reformed. But on the side of the Reformed, the statements of *negation* continue as unfailing a test as ever, because as exclusive as ever of Lutheran statements and Lutheran doctrine.

answer that what St. Paul said, he spake concerning the reception of the *Sacramentum*, not of the *Res Sacramenti*. (See e.g. Hooper, *Later Writings*, p. 498. Hutchinson's Works, p. 264.)

It has been well said—"Insto. Manducationis distinctionem in dignam et indignam non haberi nisi a Paulo: qui solus ejus meminit prioris ad Corinthios undecimo: sed ita ut huc non pertineat. Non enim producit ulterius, quam ad signa sacramentalia, panem et vinum. Diserta enim sunt verba, *Quisquis ederit panem hunc, et biberit hoc poculum Domini indigne, reus tenebitur corporis et sanguinis Domini*. Nota: ederit panem hunc, biberit hunc calicem: non vero, qui carnem et sanguinem. Rursus dico legi diserte, quicumque manducaverit carnem Christi habiturum vitam æternam: sed nunquam tamen, qui comederit quenquam perituum. Et quisquam ausit in oppositum?" (Chamier's *Panstratiæ Catholicæ*, tom. iv., p. 329, b, 1627.)

If this be so, to what purpose can it be alleged as against the natural meaning of our Article that the expressions "Partakers of Christ" and "to eat the body of Christ" are simply Scriptural expressions, and that in Scripture they signify "worthy partaking" or such partaking and such eating, whereby we dwell in Christ and Christ in us?

The question has to be asked—Does Scripture know any real partaking of Christ which is *not* such partaking? And does it tell of any eating or partaking of Christ's body without being partakers of Christ? If not, such allegations from Scripture may indeed serve to show the Scriptural character of the teaching of our Article, but they can deduct nothing from the force of its plain declaration—that such as be void of a lively faith—however they may receive the *sacramentum* to their condemnation—are yet in *no wise* partakers of Christ.

As to Bucer's own views the reader may be referred to Appendix xlv. of Strype's *Cranmer*, p. 124, sqq., Edit. 1694, for his "Sententious sayings," which will clear him (I think) of any approach to the Real Objective Presence. (See also Hospinian, iv., pp. 371, 274, 281, and Calvin's *Works*, vol. viii., pp. 652, 663, Amsterdam, 1667; "Consensus Orthodoxus," pp. 322, 384, 32, 33, 245, 348; Gorham's *Reformation Gleanings*, pp. 32, 30, 51; Bucer, "De regno Christi," pp. 57, 58, Basle, 1557.)

Let me add that the evidence adduced in this note might be materially added to, if need were. Thus e.g. (1) P. Martyr expressing his assent (1556) to the Augsburg Confession, is pressed to sign the *Concordia Witebergensis*, which he cannot do "quod per verbum Dei et conscientiam dare nequeat, destitutos vera fide, percipiendo Sacramenta corpus Christi sumere." (See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 421.) (2) Calvin writing to Schalingius says "vos omnes uno consensu asserere video, quicunque ad S. Mensam accedunt, sive impii, sive fideles, substantialiter comedere Christi carnem, et sanguinem bibere." (See *Ibid.* p. 425.) (3) Among the theses maintained by Morlinus and Stoffelius in the Heidelberg disputation (1560) is the following—"Credimus etiam et profiteamur, quod in Cœna Domini, ubi servantur verba et institutio Christi, non tantum a piis et dignis, sed etiam ab impiis, hypocritis, et infidelibus accipitur. Hoc tamen discrimine, quod ab impiis ore tantum, a piis vero ore, fide, et corde sumatur, etc." (See *Ibid.* p. 474.)

(4) In the disputation of 1586, the theologians of Würtemberg set down, under the *first* head, *six* points on which there was consent, *two* on which there was not consent. Of these the first is stated thus—"1. Quod Wirtenbergenses Collocutores censent in Sacramentali conjunctione . . . inseparabiliter copulari: ac proinde ori quorumvis sive dignorum sive indignorum accedentium exhiberi." Under the *second* head, "*De perceptione Sacramentali*," *three* points of consent are set down. Then follows, "In hoc autem non est consensus. 1. Quod Wirtenbergenses . . . credunt a quibusvis eodem oris instrumento, . . . inscrutabili modo percipi, a dignis quidem ad vitam, ab indignis ad condemnationem. Alterius autem partis collocutores docent, sicut soli menti res figuratæ præbentur, ita a solis fidelibus (ut qui soli unicum illud mentis instrumentum afferant quo Christus cum suis beneficiis apprehenditur) spiritualiter percipi." (See Hospinian, *Historia Sacramentaria*, vol. iv., pp. 649, 650. Geneva, 1581.)

(5) Calvin says, "Alterum caput controversiæ est de promiscua manducatione: quia nos ita asserimus omnibus offerri Christi carnem et sanguinem, ut soli fideles inæstimabili hoc thesauro fruantur. . . . Adversarii nostri corpus et sanguinem ita sub pane et vino includunt, ut sine ulla fide vorentur ab impiis." ("Admonitio ultima ad Westphalum"; in *Works*, vol. viii., p. 699. Amsterdam, 1667.)

(6) But Calvin's treatises on this subject, will be found to be full of evidence on this point. See especially vol. viii., pp. 656, 660, 674, 692, 698, 744; vol. ix., pp. 266, 256.

(7) The three last chapters of the "Consensus Orthodoxus" of Gualter are these :—

(a) "Responsio ad Argumentum de Corporali præsentia, ex verbis cœnæ, etc."

(b) "Responsio ad usitatum Argumentum de manducatione indignorum."

(c) "Quomodo indigni manducare dicantur Corpus Christi, et de duplici ejus apud patres appellatione."

At the end, p. 409, among sayings of Luther, which can no wise be reconciled with truth, we have, "VIII. Sacramentarios et Suermeros esse omnes, qui non credunt panem Dominicum in Cœna esse, ipsum verum et naturale Corpus Christi, quod impius Judas æque bene oraliter accepit, ac S. Petrus."

(8) The 8th of the Articles of Torgau declares that "non tantum beneficium Christi, sed etiam ipsum verum corpus una cum pane ore accipiatur, sive cum fide, sive sine fide signa illa accipiantur." (See especially Hospinian's observations on this in *Concordia Discors. Works*, vol. v., p. 47.)

(9) The *Formula Concordiæ* declares—"Credimus, docemus et confitemur, non solum vere fideles et dignos, sed etiam indignos et infideles, verum corpus et sanguinem Christi, non tamen ad vitam et consolationem, sed ad judicium et condemnationem percipere, si non emendentur et resipiscant." And it condemns those who teach "Quod Corpus Christi in sacra cœna non oraliter cum pane, sed tantum panis et vinum ore, corpus autem Christi *spiritualiter tantum fide* percipiatur." It condemns also those who teach "Quod increduli et impœnitentes Christiani in sacra cœna, non verum corpus et sanguinem Christi, sed tantum panem et vinum percipiant." (See Hospinian, vol. v., pp. 126, 127.)

Could there be a much more direct and distinct condemnation of our Articles? Have we not in the two Formularies (Lutheran and English) declarations, and statements, and teachings of Eucharistic doctrine—*adversis frontibus pugnantis*?

(10) Among the "Articuli Visitatorii (1592) in Electoratu et provinciis superioris Saxonix publicati," under Articulus I., the sixth head declares, "Quod oralis perceptio corporis et sanguinis Christi non solum fiat a dignis, verum etiam ab indignis, qui sine pœnitentia et vera fide accedunt." And in the same Articles, under the "Falsa et Erronea doctrina Calvinistarum," the sixth head, under "De Sacra Cœna," is set down thus—"Quod soli digni illud accipiant, indigni autem, qui talem fidem evolantem sursus in cœlos non habent, nihil præter panem et vinum accipiant."

Perhaps the following extract from the *Formula Concordiæ* may be regarded as rendering any further evidence superfluous—

"*Status Controversiæ, quæ est inter nos et Sacramentarios, in hac Articulo.*

"Quæritur, an in sacra cœna verum corpus et verus sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi vere et substantialiter sint præsentia, atque cum pane et vino distribuantur, et ore sumantur, ab omnibus

illis, qui hoc Sacramento utuntur : sivi digni, sivi indigni, boni aut mali, fideles aut infideles : ita tamen, ut fideles e cœna Domini consolationem et vitam percipiant : infideles autem eam ad iudicium sumant. Cingliani hanc præsentiam et dispensationem corporis et sanguinis Christi in sacra cœna negant : nos vero eandem asseveramus." ("De Cœna Dom.," p. 597 of "Concordia, Pia et unanimi Consensu, etc.")

The following extract from Archdeacon Hardwick will doubtless carry with it weight—

"The controversy was no longer touching the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, nor of His actual communication then and there to every faithful recipient. So far the Lutheran and Calvinist were now agreed ; yet, while the former taught that Christ was present in the elements, and so connected with them after consecration, that *even the wicked* to their detriment became *partakers* of His glorified humanity, the latter contended no less strenuously that Christ is not communicated *in* or *through*, but rather *with* the consecrated bread and wine ; the union of the outward and inward parts of the Sacrament being always *conditioned* by the *faith* of the recipient." (Reformation, p. 167.)

If, however, it had been said that *the reception of the inward part* had been thus conditioned, the view of the Reformed would have been, I think, more accurately represented. By virtue of the Sacramental union the inward part was held to be always *offered*, even when, for lack of faith, the soul of the recipient could not receive it.

Dean Goode has justly observed—"For the great question which has always divided the two main schools of doctrine in this matter—that is, those who have held a substantial presence of the body of Christ in, or with, or under the form of the elements, and those who have denied it—has been, whether the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith only or the mouth. The former have held it to be the mouth, considering faith to be only necessary for securing certain benefits from the reception, not for the reception itself : the latter, with the Article, have held it to be faith." ("Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 647.)

Note D, p. 448.

Mr. Sedley Taylor says, I think, very truly, "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith—When in the first sentence the body of Christ is spoken of as 'given, taken, and eaten in the supper,' we must, I think, understand the same kind of reception intended as is expressed by 'received, and eaten in the supper' in the second. This identity of subject is still clearer in the Latin forms of the two paragraphs. . . . The close parallelism of expression¹ in

¹ R. Ford, speaking of the 29th Article, says—"Ut viderimus in Articulo immediate præcedenti, Corpus et Sanguinem Christi non carnaliter, sed spiritualiter in

these clauses would, I think, alone suffice to show that the two 'manducations' are identical. In order, however, to have no doubt upon the point, I will prove that the Reformers were accustomed to speak of eating spiritually as equivalent to eating by faith." (Letter to the Author of Kiss of Peace, pp. 13, 14.)

Then after citing from Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper and Jewel, he concludes that the interpretation must be as follows, "The body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only through the faith of the recipients;" "or," he adds, "to use Jewel's words just quoted, 'The body of Christ is to be eaten by faith only, and none otherwise.'" (Page 15.)

Peter Martyr, in his teaching at Oxford, distinctly makes "manducatio spiritualis" to be equivalent to "manducatio per fidem," saying "Cum ibi sit manducatio tantum *spiritualis*, id est *per fidem*, qua suscipiatur verum corpus et sanguis Christi." (Loci Communes, vol. i., p. 1570, Basle, 1580.) The whole tenor of Reformed Theology, both at home and abroad,¹ may be said, I think, to support this interpretation. Cranmer says "Christ's body cannot be eaten but *spiritually*, by *believing* and remembering Christ's benefits." (On Lord's Supper, p. 204.)

So again Cranmer says "All is *spiritually with faith*, not with mouth." (Page 15.)

So Hooper believes this receiving to be "Spiritually . . . through a true and lively faith." (Later Writings, p. 49.)

So Jewel, "Spiritually and with the mouth of our faith we eat,

Sacramento manducari et bibi: Sequitur, personam spiritualem, et non carnalem, ex illo participem esse posse. Quia, licet persona spiritualis carnaliter aliquid faciat, tamen persona carnalis nunquam aliquid facere potest spiritualiter.

"Articulus hoc est prioris consecrarium. Nam quum fides est medium manducationis sacramentalis, ut impii, quibus non est fides, Christi sint participes impossibile est." (Ford on the 39 Articles, p. 288, London, 1720. The latter part is quoted from Welchman. See also Veneer on the 39 Articles, vol. ii., pp. 664, 665, London, 1730.)

¹So Bullinger, "Neque . . . corporaliter editur, sed spiritualiter, id est, per fidem." (De Origine erroris. Fo. 185 b, Zurich, 1539.)

So the Later Confession of Helvetia, "quod percipiatur . . . spiritualiter per fidem" (Harmonia Confessionum, p. 110, Geneva, 1581), "received spiritually by faith" (Hall's Harmony, p. 318).

So Ursinus, "Corpus Christi est præsens in cœna, id est, communicatur nobis, scilicet *per fidem* seu *spiritualiter*." (Theses de Cœna Domini, in Works, vol. i., p. 787. Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

And again, "Certum est hanc [bibitionem] non nisi *spiritualem* esse, id est, per *sola* fidem fieri. Non igitur Sanguis Christi bibitur corporaliter, a piis et impiis." (Ibid. p. 788.)

And again, "Carnem vero et sanguinem suum, item suo modo, hoc est, *spiritualiter, vera fide* [Christus] . . . edendum et bibendum tradat." (Confessio fidei Theologorum Heidelb. De S. Cœna Dom. in Ursinus's Works, vol. ii., p. 415.)

And again, "Spirituale in Sacramentis est, quod solâ fide, corde . . . accipitur." (Works, vol. ii., p. 1383.)

So the Augsburg ministers explain this meaning thus, "manducatione spirituali, hoc est, fide." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, Part ii., 1533, in Works, vol. iv., p. 217. Geneva, 1681.)

etc. . . . The body of Christ is to be eaten by faith only, and none otherwise." (Sermon and Harding, pp. 448, 449.)

And again Jewel says, "The *spiritual* eating . . . by *faith* is the true eating." (Sermon and Harding, p. 468.)

So Hutchinson, "This *spiritual* receipt, which is by *faith*. . . . God's Holy Word knoweth no other receipt." (Works, p. 263.)

So Archbishop Sandys, "*Spiritually, by faith, we feed upon Christ.*" (Sermons, p. 89.)

So in Nowell's Smaller Catechism language almost identical with that in the Article, is followed almost immediately by the words "spiritualiter per fidem," thus "Corpus et sanguis Christi, quæ fidelibus cœna Dominica præbentur, ab illisque accipiuntur, comeduntur, et bibuntur, cœlesti tantum et spirituali modo, verè tamen atque reipsa: adeo quidem ut veluti panis sustentandi corpora, sic corpus Christi animas nostras *spiritualiter per fidem* pascendi maximam habet facultatem." (See Ford on the 39 Articles, p. 276. London, 1720.)

So Bishop Morton, uniting the teaching of the two Articles thus, "The Church of England in her 28 and 29 Article saith thus: The body of Christ is given to be eaten in this Sacrament only after a *spiritual* manner, *even by faith*; wherein the wicked, and such as be void of faith, eat it not: although they do visibly press with their teeth the Sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, yet are they in no wise partakers thereof." (On Eucharist, book v., chap. 2, sect. i., p. 311.)

So Bishop Bayly speaks of the "soul that *spiritually* receives Him *by faith*." (Practice of Piety, p. 482, 1668.) And again he says, "Whosoever drinketh it [Christ's blood] *spiritually by faith* . . . shall surely have the remission of his sins." (Ibid. p. 485.)

So Bishop Horsley, "The Church of England . . . denies not, but explicitly maintains, that 'the body and blood of Christ are verily, and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper,'—though they are taken 'after a spiritual manner;' and 'the mean by which they are received is faith.'" (Charges, pp. 162, 163. Edit. 1813.)

"The Latin runs thus: 'Corpus Christi datur, accipitur, et manducatur in Cœna, tantum cœlesti et spirituali ratione.' So that the English might just as well have been 'is given, *received*, and eaten.' But according to the Article, both English and Latin, the *reception* is only through the medium of faith, and in a heavenly and spiritual manner. The *taking* therefore of the English Article must also be so understood. The faithful must be those who *receive* or *take* in a heavenly and spiritual manner—those who have true faith." (Bishop of Llandaff's Charge, 1869, p. 145.)

Lutherans indeed did use, not uncommonly, the word ¹ *cœlestis* (as

¹ Indeed after the development of the doctrine of *ubiquity*, and that "the right hand of God is everywhere," the high Lutherans are represented as teaching "Corpus Christi corporali modo non esse in cœlo, sed in omnibus creaturis *cœlesti modo* juxta quem omnibus creaturis æque præsens sit ac Deitati." (See Hospinian,

well as *spiritualis*) without the TANTUM,¹ as applied to the mode. (See e.g. Hospinian, vol. v., p. 139.) And of such use of the word Ursinus says—"Ait, esse modum *cælestem*. Atque in *cælo* non manducatur ore corporis: et corpus Christi versatur ibi tantum visibiliter, palpabiliter, circumscripte et localiter, neque ingreditur aut existit intra hominum corpora. Si ergo *cœlestis* est iste præsentiae et manducationis modus, non est oralis, neque impiis communis." (Ursinus in Works, vol. ii., p. 1180. Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

Again he says, "Rideat universam orthodoxam Ecclesiam, quæ in celebratione cœnæ, Sursum corda et mentes se habere ad Dominum, semper publica et solenni voce clamavit. Rideat denique seipsum et totum suum gregem, qui *VOLENS NOLENS fateri cogitur*, Cœnam Domini esse actionem non tam terrenam quam *cælestem*. . . . Quid est universum Ecclesiæ ministerium, nisi scala quædam, nos ad Christum in cœlum attollens?" (Ibid. p. 1190.)

For further answer to the arguments of the Ritualists drawn from the expression "given, taken and eaten," I refer the reader to Paper No. VI., pp. 253-257, and 260-265, and especially pp. 254, 255.

I will add here² that (1) the claim of a necessarily objective sense

Concordia Discors, in Works, vol. v., p. 365 a, Geneva, 1678. See also vol. iv., p. 60 b.)

¹ But the assertion of our Article with the TANTUM is a contradiction in terms of Lutheran statements. See above, p. 449.

² I. As to the fact of the teaching by the Reformed of the real *giving* of the *res sacramenti*, I can scarcely think further evidence to be required. The following, however, may be added here.

(1) "Et Ecolampadius satis superque testatus est, ipsum quoque Domini corpus nobis in cœna præsens exhiberi, verum ita, ut Chrysostomus, ut Patres reliqui crediderunt, nudæ animæ et puræ menti, eique in cœlestia sublevatæ." (Bucer in letter to Pontanus. See "Historia Comitiorum MDXXX. Augustæ Celebratorum," vol. ii., fo. 301 b.)

(2) So Bullinger:—"Signa divinitus instituta de manibus ministrorum tanquam de ipsis Dei manibus accipiunt [fideles] tanquam vera et cœlestia Dei dona, quorum efficaciam, nisi fide careant, sentiunt." (De Origine Erroris, fo. 189 b; Zurich, 1539.)

(3) Again:—"Corporis et sanguinis domini sacramenta sunt, per quæ nobis annunciat et attestatur quid *ipse nobis donet*." (De Origine Erroris, fo. 190; Zurich, 1539.)

(4) "Credo et confiteor, in sacra Christi Domini nostri Cœna, quotiescunque illa secundum ipsius institutionem celebratur, credentibus (quibus solis cœna hæc est instituta) non minus, quam discipulis in prima cœna, verum, traditumque et crucifixum Christi Corpus una cum omnibus ejus cœlestibus thesauris et donis, quæ sua morte suis acquisivit, ut sit famelicæ ipsorum animæ cibus, et suum sanguinem, quem in remissionem peccatorum effudit, ut sit potus, a Christo ipso *porrigi*, et *distribui*." (Confessio Fidei Principis D. Friderici III. Pii, Comitiss Palatini—in Works of Ursinus, vol. ii., p. 455; Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612. Also in Corpus et Syntagma Confessionum, pp. 132, 153; Geneva, 1654.)

(5) "Dominus visibile illud symbolum nobis porrigendo, una DAT etiam nobis suum corpus." (Calvin on 1 Cor. xi. 24.)

(6) "Illud mihi est extra controversiam, veritatem hic cum suo signo conjunctam esse: hoc est, non minus vere nos, quantum ad vim spirituales attinet, participes corporis Christi fieri quam pane vescimur." (Calvin on 1 Cor. xi. 24.)

(7) "Non simpliciter hic datur nobis Corpus Christi, sed in cibum." (Calvin on 1 Cor. xi. 24.)

for the word "eaten" cannot stand for a moment before any acquaintance with the writings of the Reformers, either Continental or Eng-

(8) "Accipite et manducate; sensus verborum est, Communicando in fractione panis secundum ordinem et ritum a me præceptum, participes quoque corporis mei eritis." (Calvin on 1 Cor. xi. 24.)

(9) "When the minister bringeth towards thee the bread thus blessed and broken, and offering it unto thee, bids thee, *Take, eat, etc.*, then meditate that Christ Himself cometh unto thee, and both offereth, and *giveth* indeed unto thy faith, *His very body and blood*, with all the merits of His death and passion. . . . The bread of the Lord is given by the minister, but the bread which *is the Lord* is given by Christ Himself." (Bishop Bayly's "Practice of Piety," pp. 481, 482. London, 1668.)

(10) "The truth is not absent from the sign, neither doth Christ deceive when He saith, This is my body; but He *giveth* Himself indeed to every soul that *spiritually* receives him by faith." (Ibid. p. 482.)

[What will modern Presbyterians think of the allegation, that to teach of a real *giving* of the body of Christ in the Supper must mean, or ought to mean, the teaching of the Real Objective Presence—that to believe in the *gift* must imply the Adorable Presence of the body and blood under the forms of bread and wine?

But do any Presbyterians believe or teach any such gift?

Let Dr. H. Bonar give answer. "*The giving.* In many ways Christ gave Himself to us; but here it is especially as the sin-bearer that He does so. It is His *broken* body that He presents to us. This is His gift to us. That broken body, with the sin-bearing work which it accomplished, He *gives* to us. It is the gift of His love; the love that passeth knowledge." (Light and Truth: The Gospels, p. 256.)]

II. If further evidence be desired as to the teaching of reality of the THING (*the Res Sacramenti*) thus given, the following may be added:—

(1) "Verus ergo et vivificus animæ cibus est caro Christi, verus et salutaris potus est sanguis Christi, atque hic adeo verus et unicuique animæ cibus et potus est, ut post hunc anima fidelis alium non cupiat. . . . Quæris, Quodam modo edere possis carnem Christi veram de virgine natam, et sanguinem qui de latere fluxit? Certo enim constat de his in præsentiarum loqui Dominum. Respondeo, CIBUM quidem non esse SPIRITUALEM. Veram enim carnem verumque sanguinem habet Dominus, unde edendi percipiendique ratio spiritualis est." (Bullinger, *De Origine Erroris*, fol. 185. Zurich, 1539.)

(2) So Ursinus, "Ergo in cœna Corpus Christi verum et corporeum, carneum et osseum, *non nisi spiritualiter* manducatur. Objectum CORPORALE est: ergo acceptio SPIRITUALIS est." (Consideratio Commonefactionis Chytræi de S. Dom. Cœna, in Works of Ursinus, vol. ii., p. 1179. Edit. Reuter. Heidelberg, 1612.)

(3) "Certo cognoscitur . . . omnes credentes, non modo beneficiorum Christi omnium fieri participes, verum etiam, quia Christus hoc promisit et hac cœna testatum voluit, ipsam corporis et sanguinis Christi substantiam, non minus VERE ac CERTO, quam visibilem panem ac vinum edendum et bibendum eis dari." (Ursinus, *De Cœna Domini*, in Works, vol. i., p. 816. Edit. Reuter. Heidelberg, 1612.)

(4) "Quid est cœna Domini?"

"Est distributio et sumptio panis et vini in congregatione fidelium, facta ad recordationem Christi, instituta a Christo ut ipse hoc signo testetur, se *certissime fidelibus*, hanc panem et hoc vinum sumentibus, corpus et sanguinem suam ad vitam æternam *communicare*, ut fœdus in baptismo cum Deo initum, perpetuo illis ratum sit.

"... Estne manducare Christum tantum meriti Christi et donorum Spiritus Sancti participem fieri!"

"Non hoc tantum est: sed etiam ipsius Christi personæ substantiæ communicatio. Divinitas enim ipsius in nobis habitat. Corpus autem ipsius ita nostris cor-

lish. (See above, Paper No. VI., pp. 248, sqq., and 255, sqq., and No. V., p. 150.)

poribus copulatur, ut unum cum ipso simus." (Larger Catechism of Ursinus, in Works, vol. i., p. 31. Heidelberg, 1612. Edit. Reuter.)

(5) "*Quis ergo sensus est verborum Christi, cum dicit panem esse corpus et vinum esse sanguinem suum!*"

"Panem hunc fractum et a nobis manducatem, et vinum hoc a nobis haustum, credentibus esse signum ac testimonium, *corpus et sanguinem Christi* pro nobis esse traditum et fustum, et nobis PER FIDEM communicari, tam certo, quam panem et vinum sumimus ore corporis." (Ibid. p. 32.)

(6) "Scriptura testatur, neque substantiæ Christi sine beneficiis, neque beneficiorum ejus absque substantia, quenquam posse fieri participem." (Ursinus, *De cæna Domini*, vol. i., p. 815; see also pp. 818, 819, 827; vol. ii., pp. 78, 614, 1085.)

(7) "Præterea audio quid verba sonent; neque enim mortis tantum ac resurrectionis suæ beneficium nobis offert Christus, sed corpus ipsum in quo passus est ac resurrexit. Concludo, realiter, (ut vulgo loquuntur) hoc est, vere nobis in cæna dari Christi corpus, ut sit animis nostris in cibum salutare. Loquor vulgari more: sed intelligo substantia corporis pasci animas nostras." (Calvin on 1 Cor. xi. 24; see also extracts from Calvin in Cosin's Works, Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. iv., pp. 167, 168.)

(8) "I hold . . . that the real and substantial body of Christ is only in heaven, but yet that faithful communicants do, by faith and in a spiritual manner, verily receive His very body and very blood, which for us was delivered unto the cross. Wherefore I can by no means admit either transubstantiation or consubstantiation in the bread and wine of the Supper." (Peter Martyr's Declaration at Poissy, as given in Gorham's Reformation Gleanings, p. 425.)

(9) "When mention is made in these formulæ of the substance of the body of Christ, I understand by that name or word nothing else than the true body of Christ. For our faith is not directed towards a feigned object or phantom, but the true natural human body, which the word of God took of the blessed Virgin, and gave unto the cross for us. Wherefore there is no reason why we should from that Word be concluded to hold that the Real Presence is anywhere else than in heaven." (Ibid. p. 425.)

(10) "The Sacramental bread and wine therefore are not bare signifying signs but such as wherewith Christ *doth indeed exhibit and give* to every worthy receiver not only of His Divine virtue and efficacy, but also *His very body and blood.*" (Bishop L. Bayly's "Practice of Piety," p. 445. London, 1668.) "Not that Christ is brought down from heaven to the Sacrament, but that the Holy Spirit by the Sacrament lifts up his mind unto Christ." (Ibid. p. 444.)

III. Again, if further evidence be required of the teaching by the Reformed of the *real* eating and drinking (though *spiritual* only) let these examples suffice.

(1) The following is a Question and Answer from a curious English Reformed "Short Catechism: a brief and godly bringing up of youth," from the press (it is said) of Froschover, at Zurich, "Imprynted the yeare after the creation of the world, 5525, and after the byrthe of oure Saviour, 1550."

"*T. What eate we in the Supper?*"

"Ch. The faithfull eateth breade and drinketh wyne with the mouthe, but inwardly in his devout mynde he *eateth* the *body* of Christ, and *drinketh* Hys *bloude*, if he believe that Jesus dyed for hym on the crosse, and shedde Hys bloude for him, he eateth the bread of lyfe whereof the outward breade putteth him in remembrance. The unfaithfull eateth bread and drinketh wyne, he useth the tokens outwardly but inwardly he receiveth not the strength and frute thereof." (i. 6, 7.)

(2) In another part of the same Catechism (H. 8, on Lord's Prayer) we are taught, "He [Christ] fedeth our soules with Hys fleshe, and giveth us Hys bloude to drinke, when He geveeth us Hys spirite that we beleve that He gave Hys bodye

Peter Martyr says, "In Sacramento manducari Spiritualiter, sed vere, Carnem Christi, concedimus." (*Loci Communes*, vol. i., p. 1608. Basle, 1580. See the Context.)

to the crosse for oure redemption, and Hys bloude to washe away oure synnes." [With these words the reader may compare the words of Cranmer, in the Preface to his work on the Lord's Supper (published the same year as this Catechism), "He [Christ] it is that feedeth continually all that belong unto Him, with His own flesh that hanged upon the cross, and giveth them drink of the blood flowing out of His own side." The Catechism concludes with a Prayer for King Edward.]

(3) "Sacramentum non est signum tantum: sed confit duobus, signo videlicet visibili terrenove, et re significata cœlesti et divina. . . . Cum cibus ille in mensa domini propositus duplicis generis sit: est enim cibus corporalis et spiritualis, terrenus et cœlestis, visibilis et invisibilis: colligitur sane et manducationem esse duplicem, corporalem et spiritualement, terrenam et cœlestem, visibilem et invisibilem." (Bullinger, *De Origine Erroris*. Fo. 193, Zurich, 1539.)

(4) "Quemadmodum panis et vinum ista non efficiunt nisi ille edatur et hoc bibatur, ita corpus et sanguis Domini tantas virtutes in homine non exercent nisi etiam istud edatur et hic bibatur. Hinc vero est quod Dominus dixit, Accipite, dividite inter vos, edite, et bibete: cogitat ergo de modo edendi et bibendi fidelis. . . . Quod pane et vino repræsentatur, animam non corpus alit nutritque, et cibus est spiritualis, ipsum inquam Corpus Domini traditum pro nobis in mortem, et sanguis Domini in remissionem peccatorum effusus: intelligit ergo hoc spiritualiter edendum, et sanguinem ejus spiritualiter esse bibendum." (Bullinger, *De Origine Erroris*. Fo. 193 b, Zurich, 1539.)

(5) Ursinus speaking of the calumnies under which the Reformed were oppressed, says, "quasi corpus et sanguinem Christi vere in cœna Domini manducari et bibi, nos inficiaremur." (*De cœna Domini*, in *Works*, vol. i., p. 818. Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.) And he adds, "Christi enim corpus et sanguinem in cœna ipsius non solum esse, sed verè etiam edi et bibi, ex verbo Dei certo cognoscimus, idque mente et voce coram Deo, et omnibus angelis, et hominibus confitemur." (*Ibid.* p. 819.)

(6) Bishop Davenant says—"Fundamentale est, *Panem et vinum esse a Christo constituta media per quæ rite manducantes hunc panem benedictum et bibentes hoc vinum, manducant vivificant carnem Christi, et bibant ejus salutiferum sanguinem, ad salutem animarum.* Nota est omnium Evangelicorum in hoc capite concordia: non est itaque laborandum in ea probanda." (*Ad Pacem Eccl. Adhortatio*, p. 133. Cambridge, 1640.)

(7) "Tu ne putes Christum in nostris Ecclesiis sacra cœna excludi, solumque panem et vinum, inania symbola administrari. Utinam nosses, optime Lector, quam istuc abominatus semper sit pater et præceptor noster Joannes Æcolampadius. Sed sicut transitus Domini nostri Jesu Christi in cœlos, hoc tantum infert, jam Dominum hic non agere ratione hujus sæculi; ita scito nobis nihil negari, quam Christum non naturaliter et ratione hujus sæculi uniri cum pane, vel in pane includi localiter. Cæterum *verum corpus, verum sanguinem* Domini, ipsum verum Christum Deum et hominem nobis in cœna adesse, ipsiusque verbis et symbolis exhiberi *in cibum* non perituum carnis, sed sempiternum animæ: eoque non sensu aut ratione, sed *vera fide percipiendum.*" (Bucer's Introduction to the Letters of Zuingle and Æcolampadius—"Epistolæ Doctorum Virorum," 1548.)

(8) "Cum magna animi alacritate ac gratiarum actione asserimus, vere *pasci* et refici animas vero illo corpore et sanguine . . . atque ita semper testati sumus adesse Christum ipsum in cœna." (Æcolampadius in "Epistolæ Doctorum Virorum." Fol. 128 a.)

(9) "Vere dicitur fidem alicui dedisse, et falso negatur dedisse, si quis promittendo cuipiam dexteram porrexerit, et audiat: Dextera est fides: quamvis non sit substantialiter fides, neque in manu, vel in annulo sedes fidei sit, sed in pectore potius. Certus autem fit qui dextram accipit, de fide, quum dextra symbolum fidei sit. Ita nos quoque quam sciamus Christum affirmasse de pane, quod sit corpus suum quod

Zwingle writes (1527) "*Dicamus, non carnaliter edi, sed spiritualiter. Dicamus igitur spiritualiter edi Christi Corpus.*" (In "*Epistolæ doctorum virorum, quibuscum Eucharistiæ et Anabaptismi negotium, tum alia religionis Capita . . . Continentur.*" Fo. 122 a, 1548.)

(2) That the claim of such a sense for the word "*received*" is equally inconsistent with any knowledge of the language of the Reformation. (See Forbes on Articles, vol. ii., p. 558, and above, Paper No. VI., pp. 248, sqq., and 254; also Hooper, *Later Writings*, p. 479.)

Cranmer says, "I have written in more than an hundred places, that we *receive* the selfsame body of Christ, that was born of the Virgin Mary, that was crucified and buried, that rose again, ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty. And the *contention* is *only* in the manner and form how we receive it." (On Lord's Supper, p. 370.)

Peter Martyr says, "*Intelligemus . . . fideles in cœna Domini, ore corporis accipere panem et vinum: mente vero et spiritu, Corpus et sanguinem Christi, prout in cruce data fuerunt pro nostra salute.*" (*Loci Communes*, vol. i., p. 1314. Basle, 1580.)

Calvin declares, "With *one voice* we ALL *confess* that when we do according to the institution of the Lord, *receive* the Sacrament with faith, we are undoubtedly made *partakers* of the substance of the body and blood of Christ." (In Coverdale's Works, P. S. Edit., vol. i., p. 465.)

(3) That the claim of such a sense (see Forbes on Articles, vol. ii., p. 558, and Knox's Remains, vol. ii., p. 193, Edit. third) for the word "*taken*" (a) is not only refuted by the fact of its being a translation of the word "*accipitur*," which is rendered again immediately after by "*received*," but (b) even adding to the word "*received*" all the meaning which can possibly be added by the word "*taken*," is sufficiently answered by the frequent appeal of the Reformers to

pro vobis et nobis datur: minime hæsitemus, quod pro nobis corpus mortuum sit, et proinde gratias agentes spiritualiter reficimur, *vereque manducamus carnem Christi: cujus carnis spiritu, quia caro nostra facta est, vegetamur: insuper et per eam æternam vitam nos indepturos confidimus, fitque panis quem frangimus vere communicatio non solum corporis Christi, sed et participatio vitæ æternæ.*" (Ecolampadius in "*Epistolæ Doctorum Virorum.*" Fol. 184, a.)

(10) Even the Lutherans acknowledged (as they could not deny) that such language was the language of the maturer views of the Reformed. So the "*solida, plana, ac perspicua Repetitio*" which is appended to the *Formula Concordiæ*, thus states what it regards as the later doctrine of the Reformed—"Affirmarunt atque jactitarunt: se plane nihil aliud sentire, quam quod Dominus Jesus Christus vere, substantialiter, vivus in sacra sua cœna præsens sit. Hoc autem intelligunt ipsi, tantum de divina Christi natura, non autem de ipsius carne et sanguine. De his autem sentiunt, ea tantum in cœlis et præterea nullibi esse: ideoque Christum nobis cum pane et vino VERUM corpus et VERUM sanguinem MANDUCANDUM ET BIBENDUM DARE, *spiritualiter, per fidem sed non corporaliter ore SUMENDUM.*" (See "*Concordia, pia et unanami consensu repetita confessio fidei et Doctrinæ, etc.*" Lipsiæ, 1654, p. 727.)

the language of St. Augustine, as expressing their views—"Quomodo tenebo absentem; . . . fidem mitte et tenuisti."

The following example from Jewel may suffice:—"We say not . . . that Christ's body is let down from heaven, or made really or fleshly present in the sacrament. We are taught, according to the doctrine of the old fathers, to lift up our hearts to heaven, and there to feed upon the Lamb of God. . . . St. Augustine . . . saith *Quomodo tenebo absentem? Quomodo in cœlum manum mittam, ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem mitte et tenuisti*: 'How shall I take hold of him, being absent? How shall I reach up my hand into heaven, and hold him sitting there? Send up thy faith, and thou hast TAKEN him.' Thus spiritually and with the mouth of our faith we eat the body of Christ and drink His blood, even as verily as His body was verily broken, and His blood verily shed upon the cross." (Sermon and Harding, p. 448.)

Compare the following from Bishop Hooper, "*Sed neoterici . . . fingunt Christi humanitatem invisibiliter latere in terris sub speciebus panis et vini; contra manifesta testimonia omnium Evangelistarum et Apostolorum, ac etiam D. Augustini, qui dicit *Fidem mitte, ac tenuisti*: ac si dixisset, Post assumptionem Carnis Christi in Cœlum non opus est ut manum mittas in Cœlum, quo illum teneas. O si ista verba neoterici diligenter perpenderent! Si autem Augustinus credidisset Corporis Christi realem præsentiam in Eucharistia, quam apposite potuisset dicere, MANUM ministri ad altare astantis contemplare, et illic Christum latentem sub speciebus panis et vini invenias et TENEAS! Vel sic dixisset, *Recipe panem sanctum et consecratum; et sub ejus forma Christum ore percipies*. . . . Sed pius Augustinus omnem corporalem præsentiam a Judæis tollit, sic inquiens: 'Parentes tui tenuerunt carne, tu tene corde; quoniam Christus absens etiam præsens est: nisi præsens esset, a nobis teneri non posset.' Non dicit Augustinus ad Judæum, *Parentes tui tenuerunt carne et carnali modo; sed carne simpliciter*. Nec dicit, *Tu corporaliter Christum corde tene*; sed simpliciter dicit, *Corde tene*, hoc est, ut antea dixit, *Mitte fidem et tenuisti*; id est, crede in Jesum Christum; et illum TENES, et ipse te tenet." (Later Writings, pp. 489, 490.) With this the reader may compare Dr. Pusey's Sermon, "Presence of Christ in the Eucharist," p. 22, and Newman, as there quoted in note, pp. 24, 25.*

Ridley says, that Christ "is holden of the godly, such as communicate Him, not only sacramentally with the hand of the body, but much more wholesomely with the *hand*¹ of the heart, and by inward drinking is received." (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 223.)

¹ See Wordsworth's Note on *Μή μου ἄπρου*, John xx. 17. "One of the purposes," says Bishop Wordsworth, "of His absence, and of His ascension into heaven, was to elicit and to exercise that touch, [or as it is explained above, that fastening on to, or clinging to,] by which alone He can now be touched, and by which He must be touched, if virtue is to go out of Him to heal us,—the touch of faith."

Canon Norris (in his valuable "*Catechist's Manual*," Longmans, p. 57) says,

It may be added, that Grindal explains his teaching of *spiritual reception*, by the words "received and taken," thus,—“Whosoever will be relieved by the body of Christ, must *receive* Him as He will be received, with the *instrument of faith* appointed thereto, not with teeth or mouth. And whereas I say that Christ's body *must be RECEIVED and TAKEN with his faith*, I mean not that you should pluck down Christ from heaven, and put Him in your faith, as in a visible place, etc.” (Remains, p. 46.) See also the quotation from Sibbes, in Paper No. VI., p. 221, and from other Puritan divines, in pp. 205, 210, 211, 212, 213.

(4) That the claims of such a sense (see Bishop Hamilton's Charge, p. 81) for the word "given" breaks down completely before such examples as these.

(a) Calvin says, "The Lord doth in very deed *give* the same thing that He doth represent." (Calvin in Coverdale, Fruitful Lesson, etc., p. 461.) "Christ *giveth* unto us the very substance of His body and blood." (Ibid. p. 441.) "He truly *gives* and confers it [His body]." (Calvin in Cosin's Works, vol. iv., p. 168.)

(b) Cranmer says, "He *giveth* His own flesh spiritually to feed upon." (On Lord's Supper, p. 35.)

(c) Jewel says, "Our doctrine, grounded upon God's Holy Word, is this, that as certainly as Christ gave His body upon the cross, so certainly He *giveth* now the selfsame body unto the faithful; . . . therefore St. Ambrose writeth thus :—*Quid petis, O Judæe? ut tribuat tibi panem, quem DAT omnibus, DAT quotidie, DAT semper.*" (Sermon and Harding, pp. 449, 450.)

(d) Hooper, in the very next Article to that in which he had declared his belief that "we do verily and indeed *receive* His body and blood," speaks of the "*res sacramenti*" as "given" to faith, thus "I believe that this receiving is not done carnally or bodily, but spiritually, through a true and lively faith; that is to say, the body and blood of Christ are *not given to the mouth* and belly for the nourishing of the body, *but unto our faith*, for the nourishing of the spirit and inward man." (Later Writings, p. 49.)

(e) Let it be added, that the Tetrapolitan Confession (drawn up by the pacific Bucer for those who, by their¹ dissent from the Euchar-

"For this same reason—to show that effort on our part is necessary—the Catechism inserts the word '*taken*' before the word '*received*.' As the bread and wine are not received unless the hand be reached forth to take them, so what Christ offers is not received unless the *hand of faith* be reached forth to *take* it. This is the teaching of the 28th Article."

I have very little doubt that Canon Norris is quite right. An examination of the quotation in No. VI. will, I think, lead to the conclusion that the word "*taken*" in the Catechism points (by Sacramental analogy) specially to the office of faith as the soul's *hand*, and the word "*received*" to the office of faith as the soul's *mouth*. (See above, Paper No. VI., pp. 248, 249, 216. Compare also Archbishop Ussher, as quoted in p. 278, and contrast quotations in pp. 252, 253.)

¹ Dissenting, however, from the Confession of Augsburg—"verbis potius, ut aiebant, quam reipsa." Seckendorf adds—"Putabant enim, Lutherum et socios Pontificium dogma transubstantiatione non integre deposuisse et plus justo tribuere

istic doctrine of Luther, thought themselves, at that time, deterred from signing the Confession of Augsburg of 1530) acknowledges¹

elementis panis et vini: alii causabantur, verba Confessionis germanicæ . . . *sub specie panis et vini* transubstantiationem secum ferre." (Historia Lutheranismi, lib. ii., sect. 34, § lxxvii., Anno 1530, pp. 198, 199; Leipsic, 1694. On the Difference between the German and Latin Editions: see Pusey, "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," p. 337, sqq.)

Seckendorf adds—"Vocabula illa *species* in conventionem Marpurgensi anno 1529, art. xv., absque omni offensa ab utraque parte admissa fuerat, satis gnaris Helvetiis, quod Lutherus et socii non accidens illud scholasticum, sed elementa ipsa seu substantiam panis et vini *sub specie* intelligerent." (Page 199 a.)

Ursinus, maintaining that there is no real repugnance between the teaching of the Reformed and that of the Augsburg Confession, says—"Porro, quod in Germanicis exemplaribus legitur, corpus et sanguinem Christi sub specie panis et vini adesse in cœna, id nihil sublebat adversarios. Tametsi enim recte docentes in Ecclesia, et antiquitus et nunc aliquando sic loquuntur, ut in vel sub visibilibus rebus, videlicet pane et vino, dicant Christi corpus et sanguinem sumi; sicut nimirum in vel sub mysteriis et symbolis res significatæ, ut Christus sub petra et manna. Spiritus et sanguis Christi in vel sub aqua baptismi, sacramentaliter videlicet ac spiritualiter non quidem in vel sub visibilibus rebus invisibiles, realiter et corporaliter occultari, sed subesse et accipi, hoc est, ideò, has per illas significari, representari et intelligi dicuntur, ut per eas tanquam per Spiritus Sancti instrumenta credentibus communicentur. Tamen quia seculis aliquot superioribus, istæ loquendi formæ alienum in sensum raptæ sunt, ut etiamnum a quibusdam aliter accipiantur, quàm olim usurpatæ fuerunt, non solum hæc verba ab ipsis Confessionis auctoribus, statim initio in Latinis exemplaribus expuncta et repudiata sunt: et recens a Principibus eam Confessionem agnoscentibus, exemplaria illa sunt approbata, in quibus ista verba non leguntur: denique hæc et sententia et loquutio, quod Christi corpus adsit in specie panis, tanquam recens à monachis conficta et veteribus ignota in consensu Francofordiano anni 1558 diserte rejecta est, ut infra videbitur." ("Vera Sententia Augustanæ Confess.," in Works, vol. i., p. 888; Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612. See also vol. ii., pp. 1479, 1480.)

The reader can hardly fail to observe how Ursinus here (1) justifies the language of the Title retained in the Notice at the end of our First Book of Homilies, while at the same time (2) his words serve to indicate the sufficient cause why, for that Title, another was substituted in the list recognized by our Article.

And it may surely be taken as additional evidence that the cause here indicated was the true cause of the change, that we find the expression "in form of bread" finding place in the Homily of the Resurrection, as it had appeared in Taverner's Postils (see Cardwell's Edition, p. 193), but omitted in the same Homily as adopted in the Second Book of Homilies. (See Griffith's Edition, p. 403; and Preface, p. xxxiv. See also Perry on Declaration concerning Kneeling, p. 265; to whom I am indebted for the reference to Mr. Griffith's Edition.)

¹ Dr. Pusey, indeed, regards the language of this Confession as inconsistent. He thinks it ought to mean the Real Presence "honestly understood." He says it "ought to be understood of a real objective presence." (See "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 86, 87, 88.) But why should it be supposed that the language was dishonest? Why should it use words not intended to be "honestly understood"? Dr. Pusey supports his view of the Confession by saying that it "appeals to His words, 'This is my body,' as the proof that His body is really given in it." No doubt it does make such an appeal as proof that the body of Christ is really given in the Sacrament. But to argue that, therefore, the language must be the language properly belonging only to the Real Objective Presence, is surely to argue on an assumption, which not only begs the whole question, but which ought to be regarded as abundantly refuted by this Confession itself. It is an

"that goodness of Christ towards His followers, whereby, no less now than at His Last Supper, to all His sincere disciples, as oft as

assumption which (I am persuaded) the Reformed would have repudiated. It is an assumption which lays to their charge the denial of that which they did not deny, however the opposition of error may sometimes have kept it in the background of their teaching. (See Calvin in Coverdale, "Fruitful Lessons," etc., pp. 464, 465.) Where is the evidence of their denial of that which it is here assumed that they must have denied? Where is the evidence that they did not, equally with Lutherans, believe in a *real giving*? Could there be no *giving* of the *res sacramenti*, without its being corporally under the sacramental signs? That there could not, is what the Reformed would indeed have denied. Why, then, should there be any inconsistency or dishonesty in their declaring and professing that Christ "vouchsafes to give by sacraments His own true body and His own true blood for the food and drink of their souls"? Surely those for whom the Confession was drawn up may, not unfairly, be regarded as capable judges of the agreement between these words and their own views.

Does the "Harmonia Confessionum" require any deduction to be made from the teaching of this Confession?

Does Hospinian express any dissent from the language of this Confession? Does he tell us of any one who did object to its language as saying *too much*? He *does* tell us that it fell under suspicion of teaching *too little*, of teaching "nuda, seu vacua et inania signa in Cœna Dominicâ." He *does* tell us of a Protestation which was therefore added. And in that Protestation are these words—"Nostri concionatores semper docuerunt, quod Dominus discipulis suis *verum suum corpus*, et *verum suum sanguinem edendum et bibendum* DEDERIT. . . . Neque ideo Patres senserunt, inane signum esse panem, sed quod simul cum eo DARETUR *verum corpus Christi*." (See Hospinian, *Historia Sacramentaria*, Part ii., 1530, in *Works*, vol. iv., p. 166; and vol. v., p. 443. Geneva, 1681.)

Seckendorf says of the Tetrapolitan Article on the Eucharist: "Illum [Articulum] autem ita conceperunt, ut Zuinglii sententiæ diserte non adversaretur, quapropter et illum postea probavit, non dissimulans etiam, quæ non prorsus ei placebant." (*Hist. Luth.*, lib. ii., sect. 35, § lxxvii., p. 199.)

See also "Analecta de Reformatione Argentinensi et cum primis de Confessionis Tetrapolitanæ apud eos usu et auctoritate diuturniori," in "Scrinium Antiquarium," of D. Gerdes, Groningæ et Bremæ, 1756, vol. v., pp. 193, sqq.; and especially p. 200, where are given the different judgments on this Confession of two Lutheran doctors. The letter of Bucer which follows (pp. 222-228) will make it quite clear how little "the Real Objective Presence" was intended to be taught by that Confession.

No doubt the Confession has received the impress of Bucer's mind, who desired to make it appear that the doctrine of Luther was really (as Bucer believed) on a level (or nearly on a level) with the doctrine of the Reformed.

Hence its general character may be truly said to be less guardedly cautious, and far less distinctly anti-Lutheran than some other Reformed Confessions—especially than the latter Helvetic Confession, and than our own xxxix. Articles.

Its doctrinal definitions may be said rather to aim at fencing ground *common* to Lutherans and Reformed—but withal, ground which was (to say the least), quite as much, and quite as truly, Bucer's (not to say Zuingle's) as Luther's.

It is scarcely to be wondered at, therefore, that the Confession should have been regarded by some as holding something of an intermediate place between the teaching of the Lutherans and of the Swiss. (See Gerdes, *Scrinium Antiquarium*, vol. v., pp. 199, 200; and Augusti, *Corpus Librorum Symbolicorum*, pp. 639, 640; Edit. 1827.)

But as the Confession teaches nothing more than Bucer and others constantly taught, and in Bucer's sense was always (I believe) consistently and *bona fide*

they repeat this Supper, He *condescends* TO GIVE, by the sacraments, *His real body and His real blood*, to be truly eaten and drunken, as the food and drink of their souls." (See Hall's Harmony of Confessions, p. 365; and Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 140, note; Edit. Soames, 1845. Also Hardwick's History of Reformation, p. 57; Second Edit.

(f) Moreover, the Helvetic Confession (1566) says, "They [the faithful] put a difference, in the administration of the Sacraments, between the Lord Himself and His minister; confessing that the substance of the Sacraments *is given* them of the Lord, and the outward sign by the ministers of the Lord." ("Confitentes sacramentorum res *dari* ab ipso Domino, symbola autem a Domini Ministris.") (See Hall's Harmony of Confessions, p. 283, and Sylloge Confessionum, p. 76. Oxford, 1827.¹)

(g) Thus Hospinian contends that he and the Reformed party

accepted by the Reformed; and as none will maintain that Bucer ever taught the "Real Objective Presence;" so it is, I think, impossible to maintain that the language of the Confession can be at all fairly regarded as being anything like the property of "*Real Objective*" doctrine.

Gerdes says—"Quid? quod, quarto iv. vel ideo post Conventum adhuc Smalcaldicum Argentinenses *Apologiam* suam (manifesto indicio, quam suam non tam immutassent, quod tamen fecerant Saxonici, quam potius dilucidius explicassent atque a calumniis vindicassent sententiam) auctore Bucero evulgarint, quæ in capite de S. Coena, eandem, quam etiam in Confessione tuiti fuerant, tuetur sententiam; Sicque *primo* pernegat, 'quod in Coena Domini nudum ac simplicem, vel communem tantum panem, qualem pistor coquit, agnoscant, sed firmiter et ex animo credere se ac docere asserit, *veram ac substantialem exhibitionem et sumptionem veri corporis et sanguinis Christi*. Simul tamen confiteri se, *ad talem exhibitionem et perceptionem, necessariam non esse corporalem existentiam seu praesentiam* in terrenis elementis panis et vini, *quod hoc pugnet*, cum veritate et proprietatibus inconsumptis humani corporis Christi.'" (Scrinium Antiquarium, vol. v., p. 202.)

It is surely impossible in the face of this to maintain for the Tetrapolitan Confession a "*Real Objective*" sense, or to claim for the language it contains a distinctively "*Real Objective*" sound.

Gerdes adds, after concluding his extract from the "*Apologia*"—"Est autem hæc eadem illa sententia, quam deinde tanquam Zwinglianam et Calvinianam denigarunt ac damnarunt inter Lutheranos Ubiquistæ, passim per Germaniam." (Page 203.)

¹ It will be observed how distinctly this Confession speaks of the *giving* of the *Res Sacramenti* to the faith of the believer.

A fair examination of the subject, however, will, I feel sure, make it evident that the difference between the Reformed theology on the one side, and that of the Romanists and Lutherans on the other, was *not* in *this* that the one denied and the other taught a *giving* and *receiving*, but that while the un-reformed taught a giving in the elements and by the priest, the Reformed believed that while the minister gave the elements to the hand or mouth of the body, Christ Himself gave the *Res Sacramenti* to faith as the hand and mouth of the soul. (See above, Paper No. VI., pp. 244-250.)

The writings of Ursinus will be found to be very full in their elucidation of this point. And nothing can be clearer than the teaching of our own Hooker. But the general harmony on the subject among Reformed theologians is very striking.

could consistently accept the tenth Article of the Confession of Augsburg. He says, "Hæc verba, licet breviter, ambigua propter generalitatem, et obscura, nihil continent, quod nostræ sententiæ adversetur." (Histor. Sacr., Pt. ii. See "Goode on Eucharist," vol. ii., p. 984.)

To make the sense harmonize with the views of the Reformed, he needs no explaining away of the words which contain the reality of the giving. All he requires is, that the *Giver* be understood to be—*not the minister* giving the elements, *but Christ Himself* giving His own body and blood. He says, "Non rejiciunt igitur nostri Confessionem Augustanam . . . nempe quod in cœna Domini una cum pane et vino, hoc est, dum sacramentum Corporis et sanguinis Domini percipitur, *vere etiam exhibeantur ipsum Corpus et sanguis Domini fide percipienda.* Dum enim *ministri* sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi distribuunt, *Christus ipse* sese impartit spiritually fruendum." (Ibid.)

So also Calvin declares, "Ego certe in eorum numero sum, qui Augustanam Confessionem sequi et probare volunt, cum in aliis omnibus, tum etiam in illo capite quod est de Cœna Domini." (Quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," vol. ii., p. 986.)

So Peter Martyr also professed himself ready "Libenter amplecti, profiteri, ac si opus fuerit velle pro viribus tueri," the Augsburg and other kindred Confessions, "si recte atque commode intelligantur." (See Hospinian, *Historia Sacramentaria*, vol. iv., p. 421. Geneva, 1581.) See also Bucer's Justification of the Subscription to the Augsburg Confession by the four cities, 1533. (Ibid. p. 215.)

So also Ursinus will be found contending that the doctrine of the Reformed is in harmony with the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession. (Exegesis veræ doctrinæ, cap. ix., in Works, vol. i., p. 887, sqq. Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.) After quoting Art. x., he says, "Id nos corde et ore agnoscimus et fatemur" (p. 888). See also vol. ii., pp. 614, 1262, 1426.

Calvin, quoting the Ratisbon edition of the Augustan Confession, says, "Verba sunt in Sacra Cœnâ cum pane et vino *vere dari Christi Corpus et sanguinem.* Absit vero, ut nos vel Cœnæ symbolo auferamus suam veritatem, vel pias animas tanto beneficio privemus." ("Expositio" of the *Consensus Tigurinus*. Vol. viii., 654.)

Again, he maintains that this Confession is in harmony with the *Consensus Tigurinus*. (Ibid. p. 654.)

Hierome Zanchius also consented to sign the Augsburg Confession. (See Zurich Letters, vol. ii., p. 104.)

In like manner the "Harmonia Confessionum" will be found to express its general approval of the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession on the Lord's Supper, and in the explanation of it to require nothing to be deducted from its obvious teaching as to the *reality* of the *giving* of the *Res Sacramenti*. (See especially Obs. I., p. 127.)

Other examples, I think, would be superfluous.

(5) That the claim of such a sense for the joint expression, "datur,

accipitur," "given, taken,"¹ cannot stand before the use of the same expression in the "Consensus Orthodoxus," and other writings as cited above (Paper No. IV., p. 254) nor before the following words, "They ought to be surely persuaded with themselves, that the Lord doth *in very deed* GIVE the same thing that he doth represent, and so that we do *unfeignedly* RECEIVE the body and blood of Christ; yet shall they not seek it as included under the bread, or fastened, as they say, locally unto the visible sign." (Calvin, as translated by Coverdale, in "Fruitful Lessons, etc.," p. 461.)

The following is from the Commentary of Wolfgang Musculus on Matt. xxvi., p. 586, sqq. (Basil, 1578.)

¹ Ursinus declares, "Non tantum autem nos significare usu symbolorum, quid nos a Deo *accipere* credamus, sed etiam Deum significare, quid nobis *det*, probavimus hac ratione, quia Deus hæc signa nobis dat *instituendo* et per ministros exhibendo." (Anabaptisticæ sententiæ Refutatio, in Works, vol. ii., p. 1651. Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

"Quo in loco [1 Cor. x.] expresse Panis nominatur tanquam signum: et communicatio corporis Christi tanquam id quod hoc signo traditur ac percipitur. . . . Eandem loquendi consuetudinem imitatur liber Reformationis, in eo quod fatetur, duas res in cœnâ *dari et accipi*, Visibilem nempe; Panem et Vinum: et invisibilem, Corpus et Sanguinem Domini. . . . Verba Domini verba sunt traditionis et exhibitionis rerum invisibilium per visibilia signa. Ejusmodi locutiones hæc habent naturam, ut a signis quidem incipiant, sed ad id quod cum signis traditur, penitus derivantur." (Bucer, Constans Defensio Christ. Reform. Hermann. Arch. Colon., pp. 196, 197. Geneva, 1613.)

"Cum itaque ista ratio ac forma confitendi, *dari* nobis, et *accipi* a nobis in S. cœnæ mysteriis corpus et sanguinem, quæ est in libro Sacrorum proposita, sit omnino usurpata a Domino ipso (absit enim, absit, ut dicamus eum nos in sua cœna jubere tantum panem et vinum a se *accipere*, et *manducare* atque *bibere*) . . . et non etiam ea, quæ tam clavis verbis simil offert, suum corpus et sanguinem) . . . Ego spe bona sum hanc ipsam loquendi de hoc mysterio formam et rationem omnino, ita ut est in libro explicata, iri retentum." (Bucer's *censura* in Scripta Anglicana. Basil, 1517, p. 456.)

"In dictione corpus, nullus tropus est, Dominus enim suum corpus dicit, et id ipsum *offerebat*, alia licet ratione *recipiendum* et *edendum*, quam recipiantur et edantur, quæ sensibilibus et modo hujus sæculi offerentur recipienda et edenda carni." (Bucer, "Defensio adversus axioma Catholicum, id est criminationem R. P. Roberti Episcopi Abrincensis,"—No pagination.)

"Dominus Jesus . . . idipsum corpus et sanguinem suum, sacramentis, pane et vino, discipulis *præbuit*, et jussit *accipere* ea, *edere*, et *bibere*, idque facere ad sui commemorationem, quod illi religiose quoque fecerunt." (Bucer, "De vera et falsa cœnæ Dom. administratione." Neuburgi Danubii, 1546, pp. 306, 307.)

"Docendi itaque sunt homines, Christum Dominum non pani et vino, sed piis mentibus offerri per verba Domini et hæc symbola. . . . Christus Dominus *dat* se quidem fidelibus suis verè in cibum vitæ æternæ fruendum, usus ad id verbis suis, et panis vinique symbolis. . . . In hoc itaque usu *præbitionis* et *acceptionis* a Domino institutæ, panis et vinum symbola sunt corporis et sanguinis Christi, quibus seipsum nobis offert. Extra vero hunc usum, sunt quod alius panis et vinum. Nihil enim naturæ in illis mutatur: nec præbetur illis, sed fidelibus mentibus, Christus Dominus." (Bucer's *Censura* in Scripta Anglicana. Basil, 1557, p. 464.)

Ecolampadius also wrote, "Nos hic ostendimus ita *datum*, ut *recipiatur*." (In "Epistolæ doctorum virorum, quibus cum Eucharistiæ et Anabaptismi negotium, tum alia religionis capita . . . continentur." Fol. 54 b, 1548.)

"Veritas . . . in eo [sita est] ut . . . vere id quoque *sumendum* ipse *præbeat*." (Harm. Confessionum. Obs. I., p. 127.)

"Panis ac vinum non id sunt, quod principaliter *datur* . . . Quid ergo est, quod *dedit* Christus? Id non est aliunde quam ex animo tradentis judicandum. . . . Quid ergo dixit? Accipite, inquit, id manducate, hoc est: quid, quæso, Christe? hoc est corpus meum. . . . Audis expositionem doni. . . . *Donum datur*, non signum tantum declaratur. . . . Duplex est signorum genus. Significativum unum, exhibitivum alterum. . . . Quid aliud de mensa Domini *acciperem*, quam quod ipse convivator Christus convivis suis *dare* se dixit? Corpus suum dedit, non panem: sanguinem dedit non vinum." (Pages 586-7-8-9.) . . . "Puto igitur manifestum esse, eos qui significationem tantum Corporis Christi et memoriam in cœna docent, in hoc deficere, quod mentem Christi non satis observant, et quod principaliter agitur, minus quam par sit, exprimunt. . . . Potuisset et Paulus dicere, Panis, quem frangimus, memoria est Domini: verum maluit principaliter inculcare communionem Corporis et sanguinis Domini." (Ibid. p. 592.)

It is important to observe that these words are taken from an edition bearing conspicuously on its title-page the words, "Sunt autem omnia ipsius Authoris diligentia et manu recognita," and published (1578) long after Musculus had put forth (probably 1549) that "Explanation" (of what he had written on this subject in this Commentary,) which so much displeased Bucer, and which so clearly showed that the writer had completely separated himself from all fellowship with the views of those who desired even to seem to symbolize with the views of the Lutherans. In 1551 Musculus was invited by Cranmer (as he had been also in 1548) to come to England, that he might occupy the post vacant by the death of Bucer. (See Gorham's Reformation Gleanings, p. 109, note.) His "Explanation" may be seen in Gorham's Reformation Gleanings, pp. 108-111. (See also pp. 103, 245, 265, 494.)

It must be perfectly evident, I think, that in the view of W. Musculus, there can have been in the putting away of Lutheran or quasi-Lutheran opinions, no putting away of the reality of the *giving* and *receiving* of the *Res Sacramenti*. He must have judged that such language as speaks in the strongest way of such *giving* and *receiving* needs not and *ought not* to be *explained away*, however desirable it may be that it should be *so explained*, as to make it clear that it is to be understood as *only after a heavenly and spiritual manner*.

(6) That the claim of any such Real Objective sense for the three-fold expression, "given, taken, and eaten," is completely destroyed by its recurrence in Nowell's Smaller Catechism. (See above, Paper No. VI., p. 196), where, it will be observed, we find language bearing a very close resemblance indeed to that of this part of our Article;—"The body and blood of Christ, which in the Lord's Supper, are *given* to the *faithful*, and are by them *taken, eaten*, and drunken, only in a *heavenly and spiritual manner*, but yet *in truth*."

Let me be allowed to add, that it seems to me to have been strangely left out of sight in arguing upon the Article, that these

words, "*given, taken, and eaten,*" are evidently intended (as it appears to me,) to refer to the Institution, and the words of Institution. Now we altogether mistake the object of our Reformers, if we imagine that in removing from our faith the Real Corporal Presence in the elements, they had any design whatever to take away anything of the fulness of the teaching of the Institution (in connexion with the teaching of John vi., especially verse 27,) and of the words of Institution.

Indeed, it may be said, I think, to have been their constant aim, to bring back the doctrine of this sacrament, to the true teaching (as they were persuaded) of the Institution.¹ (For evidence of this the reader may be referred, e.g., to Cranmer, "*On Lord's Supper,*" pp. 28, 29, 30, where the words may especially be noted, "*Things spoken and done by Christ, and written by the holy Evangelists and St. Paul, ought to suffice the faith of Christian people, as touching the doctrine of the Lord's Supper*" (page 30); to Jewel, "*Harding, Thess., etc.,*" pp. 623, 624; to Becon, "*Catechism, etc.,*" pp. 228, 229, 231, 232, 509; "*Prayers, etc.,*" 232, 254, 256, 258, 259, 267, 269, 279-283, 358, 365; to Ridley, "*Works,*" pp. 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17; to Hutchinson, "*Works,*" pp. 221, 226, 227, 235, 255; to Coverdale, "*Fruitful Lessons, etc.,*" pp. 79, 430, 431; to Bradford, "*Sermons, Meditations, etc.,*" pp. 83, 86, 489; to Hooper, "*Early Writings,*" pp. 180, 181; "*Later Writings,*" pp. 47, 464, 465; to Calhhill, "*Answer to Martiall,*" pp. 231, 232, 233. See also Ursinus, in *Works*, vol. i., p. 271. Oswald Myconius, in "*Ad Sacerdotes Helvetiæ Suasoria,*"

¹ "*Quo pacto fieri potest, ut fractio et manducatio panis et sumptio vini externa et corporalis nos internæ hujus et spiritualis manducationis certiores reddat ?*"

"*Cum Spiritus sanctus corda nostra ad firmiter credendum permoveat, ea Christi promissione, quod omnes credentes et fractum hunc panem edentes et calicem distributum bibentes, fracto in cruce pro ipsis Christi corpore et effuso sanguine certissime pascantur et potentur.*"

"*Ubi hoc nobis promittitur ?*"

"*In cœna institutione, ubi Christus panem et vinum corpus et sanguinem suum nominat : Quæ sic ab Evangelistis et Paulo Apostolo describitur : Dominus Noster,*" etc. (*Catechesis Minor of Ursinus, in Works*, vol. i., p. 40. Edit. Reuter. Heidelberg, 1612.)

"*The leading preparation was a plain one : It was the PASCHAL SUPPER . . . Therefore, the words of the Institution do not, as M. Bossuet pretends, carry their whole meaning within themselves ; but refer to things preceding and exterior. He trifles with us, when he challenges us to find a place in Scripture where the sign hath the name of the thing signified, given to it at the moment of the institution of the Rite, and without any leading preparation. We have shewn there was a leading Preparation.*" (*Warburton's Discourse on Lord's Supper ; in Works*, vol. x., p. 344. Edit. Hurd, 1811.) "*I take in both what He said and did ; and not only that, but the mode of saying and doing, relative to the time, the occasion, the manners, and the customs of the age ; as being persuaded, that the speaker's meaning can be but very imperfectly understood without taking in all these things.*" (*Ibid.* p. 317.)

See also a very forcible passage on the *natural* (as opposed to the *literal*) sense of the words of Institution in "*Cautions for the Times.*" (Pages 36, 37. Edit. 3d, 1868.)

p. 14; Bullinger, "De origine Erroris," fol. 190 b, Zurich, 1539; also Bullinger in Comment. on 1 Cor. xi.)

A Lasco says, "Nos ostendemus (per Dei gratiam) veritatem ipsam verborum cœnæ non violari doctrinâ nostra, sed confirmari." ("Præfatio" to "Brevis et Dilucida de Sacramentis Ecclesiæ Christi Tractatio." London, 1552.)

In the teaching of the Reformed, the rejection of the Corporal Presence in the elements, does not (I am convinced) make the *donation* of the *res sacramenti* less real, but far more real, nor the *acceptation* less real, but far more real, nor the *eating and drinking* less real, but far more real. It is with them, as regards the doctrine they teach and the doctrine they reject, not at all a question of *giving* or *not giving*, nor of *taking* or *not taking*, nor of *eating* or *not eating*.

Neither, with them, is it at all a question of *giving*, *taking*, and *eating* of the real body of Christ or of something¹ else.

But the question with them, is the question of *how*—Is it *giving* to the *body* or to the *soul*? Is it *receiving* with the hand of the *body*, or with the hand of the *soul*? (See Cranmer, as quoted p. 487.) Is it *eating* with the mouth of the *body* primarily or with the mouth of the² *soul* alone?

¹ So Peter Martyr says, "Non enim fidei apprehensio de veritate rei quicquam derogat. Quo permulti in negotio Eucharistico hallucinantur. Quando enim asserimus, carnem Christi nos per fidem manducare, atque sanguinem potare, illico subdunt: igitur non vere isthæc habemus, quasi per fidem apprehendamus carnem Christi falsam, aut sanguinem ejus confictum." (Loci Communes, vol. i., p. 915. Basle, 1580.)

And again, "Hic est observandum, quod etsi per fidem statuimus Corpus Christi et sanguinem edi aut bibi, tamen istam sumpcionem per fidem consequitur non ficta sed vera conjunctio inter nos et Christum." (Peter Martyr in Loci Communes, vol. i., p. 1598. Basle, 1580.)

² So Peter Martyr, "Illi [Capernaitæ] putarunt se verum corpus et veram carnem Christi manducaturos, quod et nos fieri concedimus. Coeterum, discrimen est in *modo* et *ratione* manducationis: Quod illi carnaliter faciendum putarunt, nos fieri spiritualiter docemus: alioquin verum corpus, et verus sanguis exhibetur, quia fides non amplectitur ficta, sed vera." (Peter Martyr, Loci Communes, vol. i., p. 1594. Basle, 1580.)

So Cranmer, "The contention is *only* in the *manner* and form *how* we receive it." (On Lord's Supper, p. 370.)

So also Calvin, "Nos quoque veram carnis Christi *κοινωνίαν* de qua loquitur Paulus, non minus luculente asserimus. *Modi* tantum *definitio* quæritur." (Calvin's "Admonitio ultima ad Westphalum," in Works, vol. viii., p. 720. Amsterdam, 1667.)

Again Calvin declares that "the controversy is simply on the *mode* of eating." ("De vera participatione," etc., vol. viii., p. 743.) Ursinus declares that the controversy is "*not* whether the flesh of Christ be eaten: for this none of us deny; but *how* it is eaten." (See "True Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," as quoted in Newin's "Mystical Presence." Page 91.)

So also the *Harmonia Confessionum* declares, "Omnes veram veri corporis, et veri sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi communicationem credimus. In *modo* communicandi hæret controversia." ("Harmonia Confessionum," Præfatio; Geneva, 1581. See also A Lasco as quoted in Jenkyn's Cranmer, Preface, p. lxxx., note.)

So Ecolampadius, "Dissidium magis est de modo præsentiae vel absentiae,

This is the question with them : and it is on *this* question, that the divergence comes in between *their* teaching and the teaching of those who maintained the Real Corporal Presence. In the answer to this question it is, that they join issue, and stand apart.

They teach (as we have seen before, Paper No. VI., pp. 244-250) that the reception and manducation is all by *faith* as the soul's hand and mouth, and that the gift is given to the soul, not by the minister, but by the Saviour Himself.

And in perfect conformity with this teaching, our Article declares that the *giving, taking and receiving* (which thus remain *untouched* in their *reality*) are "only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," and that "the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith."

Notwithstanding all that is alleged to the contrary, the truth seems to be that what is so commonly spoken of as the Swiss doctrine of the Eucharist, is a doctrine as distinctly disclaimed by the Swiss (or, at least, by their most esteemed theologians) as by the Lutherans themselves, and as truly alien from their teaching, as from that of any Christian Church. (See "R. Gualteri Apologia" prefixed to Zwingle's Works, Zurich, 1545, and especially fol. e, 2, and 3.) In the early years of their Reformation, intemperate or incautious sayings may have given occasion for misunderstanding at least, if not for reproach. But there can be little doubt that subsequently that representation of their doctrine, through which we have been too much accustomed to look at it, was a misrepresentation.

Hospinian declares, "Statuuntur a nobis pro re cælesti per panem et vinum in cœna Domini significata non ipsa solum Christi merita, aut ejus *ἐνεργεία*, sed ipsum corpus pro nobis traditum, et ipse sanguis pro nobis effusus." (Concordia Discors, in Works, vol. v., p. 48 b.)

Again he expresses the views of the Reformed thus—"In cœna Domini non ostendi tantum nobis Christum per symbola, veluti in pictura quadam ; sed sicut illa signa non tantum nobis spectanda præbentur, verum etiam in manus et os traduntur sumenda, ita quoque res per illa significatas, nobis quoque in vitam æternam *dari*, sed spirituali demum virtute per fidem participandas." (Ibid. p. 49 a. See also Œcolampadius, "Ad Billib. Pyr. de Eucharistia Responsio," fol. c. 4, c. 5, 1526.)

Lutherans indeed, conceiving that there could be no *Real Presence*, except in the *Elements*, and no *giving, receiving, or eating*, without such a *Real Presence*, did of necessity regard the Swiss doctrine (and generally the doctrine of the Reformed) as making the Sacrament void and empty, and leaving nothing but naked signs and bare memorials. But did the Reformed ever plead guilty to this charge? Did they not always indignantly repel it? Did they not always maintain that what was thus charged upon them was not

quam de ipsa præsentia vel absentia." (Quoted by Bucer, *Retractatio in Scripta Anglicana*, Basil, 1577, p. 644.)

their real doctrine at all, but their adversaries' distorted view of their doctrine?

If some in our day, standing on the same standing point as the Lutherans, find it impossible to conceive of any true *giving, receiving, and eating*, without a *Real Objective Presence* in the elements, it must be obvious that they may not argue thence that the language which (at the date of the Reformation) speaks of *giving, receiving and eating*, is necessarily *Real Objective* language, unless they can show, not only that it *seems to them* only consistent with a *Real Objective* sense, but that it was acknowledged so to be by those who were opposed to the *Real Objective* doctrine.

If the Reformed maintained then, and we are persuaded now, that there is a most true (though spiritual) *giving, receiving, and eating* of the *res sacramenti* in the Eucharist, and that *our* view deducts nothing from (but rather adds to) its truth and reality, then our opponents have a perfect right to assail our doctrine, but they certainly have no right to claim as their exclusive possession language, which on our side we have always regarded, and which we still regard, as more truly ours than theirs.

Note E, p. 451.

I have not thought it necessary to enter into the question of subscription. Cheney certainly never signed at all. After Geste's second letter the question of his subscription seems to me of no importance. Those who are curious in the matter may be referred to Lamb's *Historical Account of 39 Articles*, pp. 38, 39; and Copy II., pp. 20, 21; Copy IV., at end; Bennet, pp. 183-189; Goode, on Eucharist, *Supplem.*, pp. 7, 26, 13; Hardwick, on Articles, pp. 135, 136, Note 3; and Perry, on Declaration concerning Kneeling, pp. 77-79.

Since Geste did sign, in 1571, it must (I suppose) have been either with views changed upon further consideration and conference with other bishops, or else with some expressed protestation of exception or explanation. Bennet supposes his views changed. (*Essay on Articles*, p. 187. Edit. 1715.)

Change of view may be thought very unlikely in the time. But there seem to be some indications of something like variableness, or uncertainty, or inconsistency in his views. It may be observed, too, that, in shielding Cheney, he seems somewhat desirous of not being identified with him. Mr. Sedley Taylor seems to doubt whether Geste really held "the Real Presence" in the Lutheran sense. But then, I think, he had not seen (see Letter to Author of "Kiss of Peace," pp. 16-19) Geste's second letter. Mr. Sumner says, "I have not referred to the opinions of Guest . . . for this reason. It appears to me that quotations can be made from his writings diametrically opposed the one to the other." (In "Principles at Stake," p. 154.)

Certainly Geste's views were (at least at some periods of his life)

very different indeed from those of the modern maintainers of the Real Objective Presence.

1. Neal tells us of him, that he wrote to Cecil against the ceremonies, and gave it as his opinion, "that having been evil used, and once taken away, they ought not to be used again. . . . The Gospel teaches us to put away needless ceremonies, and to worship God in spirit and in truth. . . . He declares openly against the cross, against images in churches, and against a variety of garments in the service of God . . . for the posture [in receiving the Sacrament] that it should be rather standing than kneeling; but that this should be left to everyone's choice." (*History of Puritans*, vol. i., p. 130. See *Dugdale's Life*, Appendix IV.)

2. He was of opinion that no other garment should be used for Communion than for any other service. "For if we should use another garment herein it should seem to teach us that higher and better things be given by it than by the other service, which we must not believe." (*In Dugdale's Life*, p. 145.)

3. In disputation, June 24, 1549, he was with Grindal, Perne, and Pilkington, opposing Glin, who affirmed "The Corporal Presence of Christ in the Sacrament." (See *Grindal's Works*, P. S. Edit., p. 194, and *Ridley's Works*, p. 169.)

4. He was strongly opposed to the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. See his *Treatise against the Privy Mass*, Appendix I., in *Dugdale's life*.—"I have argued (I suppose forcibly) the priest sacrifice to be neither propitiatory nor available, neither godly nor approvable, but sinful and unsufferable." (Page 103. See also *Jewel*, "Defence," etc., p. 1199; *Zur. Letters*, i., p. 11.)

5. He was strongly opposed also to adoration, or as he calls it, a "prayable Presence." "His [Christ's] body is not honourable nor prayable merely of itself, but in respect of His Godhead personally allied and coupled therewith. Christ, both God and man, with His Father and the Holy Ghost is present at the baptism of faithful infants, where they become embodied and incorporate thereto: it is, to wit, where they eat His body, and drink His blood, as really as we do at His Supper. Howbeit no man worshippeth either His body as present at baptism, there no less presented than at His Supper, either else His Godhead, either for His own or for the presence of His said body." (See *Dugdale's Life*, p. 116.)

6. He objected decidedly to the consecration prayer of Edward's first book, saying, "This prayer is to be disliked for two causes, the first because it is taken to be so needful for the conservation, that the conservation is not thought to be without it. . . . The second cause why the foresaid prayer is to be refused is, for that it prayeth that the bread and wine may be Christ's body and blood, which maketh for the Popish transubstantiation." (See *Dugdale's Life*, pp. 147, 148.)

It will, no doubt, be observed how utterly out of harmony were Geste's views with the views of the Ritualists of our days. But it would be a mistake to suppose that there would be anything like the

same discordance with the views of Lutherans of that day. The Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence was no part of a consistent system. Rather it clung, like some parasitic branch, to a system which was alien from it, or rather repugnant to it. And thus its growth may be said to have been kept ever dwarfed and fruitless.

Geste, however, never seems to have made the same open profession of adherence to Lutheran views that Cheney did. We are told of *one* bishop, (Cheney), and *one only*, declaring himself a Lutheran in Parliament.

In 1566, Jewel, writing to Bullinger, says that "some of their brethren were so eager in disputing about that matter [*i.e.*, the vestments] as if the whole business of religion was concerned in it. . . . He thanks God that they had *no other*, nor more important debates then among them. Cheney, Bishop of Gloucester, did indeed in Parliament profess himself openly to be a Lutheran; but he was not like to have many followers." (See Burnet's Reformation, vol. iii., part i., p. 605. Edit. Oxford, 1829.)

Jewel's words are—"Unus tantum quispiam e nostro numero, Episcopus Glocestrencis, in comitiis apertè, et fidenter dixit, probari sibi Lutheri sententiam de Eucharistià; sed ea seges non erit, spero, diuturna." (Vol. iii., part 2, p. 455. Records, No. lxxxiv.)

I will venture to add a suggestion, which those who are more competent than myself to consider may reject or accept. It is this, that Geste was not really a Lutheran on this point at all, but a disciple of Bucer. The language of his second letter shews some considerable affinities to the language which Bucer used in his desire to shelter and conciliate the Lutherans. (See Hospinian, vol. iv., pp. 247 *a*, 247 *b*.)

The reader may compare with the latter part of Geste's second letter the following words of Bucer, spoken concerning the Concordia Witebergensis:—"Dum in Ecclesia Sacramentum celebratur juxta institutionem Domini, habent integrum Sacramentum et rem Sacramenti omnes, qui sunt in Ecclesia, etiamsi ex ministris vel ex sumentibus intersint indigni et perfidi, uti Judas interfuit cœnæ primæ. . . . Indignis porrigi etiam cum pane Corpus Domini, et sumi hoc ab eis, positum est propter verba Pauli, 1 Cor. xi., qui scribit, indignè sumentes reos fieri corporis et sanguinis Domini; et loquitur illic de iis, qui in Ecclesiâ sunt, et fidem Sacramenti habent, nec tamen Corpus Domini dijudicant, hoc est, donum hoc Christi non dignè æstimant." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, in Works, vol. iv., p. 253. Geneva, 1681.)

Bucer brought himself also to speak of oral manducation, something in the same way as Geste does, though meaning only the oral manducation of that which was *nominally* Christ's body, because of its consecrated relation to the word of donation. [So at least I understand him. See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 247 *a*. See also Seckendorf's Historia Lutheranismi, Lib. iii., Sect. 15, § xlvii. (5), p. 130.]

On this and on other points, however, I do not mean that Bucer's language will be found to *match* that of Geste, for whose words,

possibly, some allowance may be made, in consideration of the warmth of feeling under which he may be supposed to have written.

The reader may remark how Geste's letter to Cecil, accompanying the Service Book (see Dugdale's *Life of Geste*, pp. 142-149) manifests an animus in singular accord with the censures of Bucer. (Compare especially "Off Vestmentes," p. 145, Dugdale, with Bucer's "condemnation of those who think Christ is more received in the Sacrament of His supper than in Baptism;" also "Off praying for the deade in y^e Communion," p. 146, with Bucer's censure on the Prayer for the state of Christ's Church; also "Off the prayer in the first book for conservation," p. 147, with Bucer's censure of the Prayer of Consecration; also "Off Receiving the Sacramentes in our handes," p. 148, with Bucer's censure on giving the Sacrament into People's Mouths; also "Off receiving standinge or kneelinge," p. 149, with Bucer's censure of *Kneeling, Crossing, Smiting the Breast*, etc. See Nicholls's, *Additional Notes*, pp. 52, 53.)

Some, perhaps, may think it very unlikely that Bucer's peculiarities should so long have outlived the breaking up of the *Concord*. But there seem to have been some who were very slow indeed to believe that Lutheran language really meant what it said, and that all hope of real agreement was at an end.¹

If, then, Geste may be supposed to have been a follower of Bucer, we have no difficulty in accounting for his *penning* the "only." We have no difficulty in accounting for his desire to shelter Cheney, and to have our Articles so framed as not to be exclusive of Lutheran views. And we shall have very little difficulty in accounting for his signing the Articles, even after the letter he wrote to Cecil. For, if

¹ Even Bishop Davenant, writing in 1640, expresses himself as if the question of oral manducation might be (*in words*) conceded by the Reformed, evidently seeming to think that Lutheran Eucharistic statements might be regarded as effectually neutralized (if not completely evacuated) by their other doctrinal views. (See his "Ad Fraternal Communionem inter Evangelicas Ecclesias restaurandam Adhortatio," pp. 135, 136, 137; Cambridge, 1640.)

Many efforts were made about the same time to effect a union between the Reformed and the Lutherans, some account of which will be found in Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. iv., pp. 158-162 (Edit. Soames); but with no other result than that of making still more evident the reality of the doctrinal difference which divided them.

Bishop Bedell also, who warmly supported Dury's designs for pacification, speaking of the Lutherans and the Reformed, says, they "differed not for ought that ever I could understand, save in the manner of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist. Yea, in that also they taught uniformly, That the body and blood of our Saviour are present, not to the Elements, but to the receiver, in the use, and without transubstantiation." (See Burnet's *Life of Bedell*, pp. 135, 321. London, 1685.)

The doctrine which was in the view of these Pacificators, might not unsuitably (I think) be called "The Lutheran Real Presence, un-Lutheranized by Lutheranism." But the doctrine which they had really to do with (in the case of strict Lutherans) was "The Lutheran Real Presence fortified against Lutheranism."

And the doctrine which we have really to do with, is (I fear) "The Lutheran (or Roman) Real Presence armed for a crusade against Lutheranism and against the Reformation."

my conjecture is right, he did not at all himself hold the Real Objective Presence, only used language approaching that of the Lutherans with respect to the reception and eating by the unworthy, as meaning that those who knew the relation in which the consecrated elements stood by the institution of Christ to His crucified body and blood, could not receive the elements without the responsibility of the formal donation of Christ's body and blood. Those who, like Bucer, chose (as it seems to me) to express this truth (as some ancient Fathers) by saying that such unworthily received Christ's body (as receiving and eating that which they knew to be consecrated for the conveyance—in giving and receiving and eating—of Christ's body), differed *verbally only* from the Reformed [Calvin in particular strongly insists on the same thing,—see his Works, vol. viii., pp. 656, 666, 674, 692, 744, 698; vol. ix., pp. 266, 256], *really* from the Lutherans, with whom they brought themselves into some sort of *verbal agreement*, although in their desire for reconciliation they seem to have persuaded themselves that the Lutherans also did not really mean much more than themselves.

Such men, under the persuasion that Lutherans differed from the Reformed in forms of expression rather than in the doctrine of the Presence, were anxious to assimilate the language of the Reformed, as far as possible, to that used by the Lutherans, and to get the Reformed to shun all such sayings and expressions as were condemned by the Lutherans.

While not really abandoning the doctrine of the Reformed, they seemed to be, and were by some regarded, as almost Lutherans themselves. Defending and shielding and maintaining (to some extent) the language of Luther, they seemed to be defending and shielding and maintaining the real doctrine of Luther; which doctrine, however, as it was certainly not theirs, so they persuaded themselves (or brought themselves to hope, if not to believe) that neither was it truly his.

If, then, Geste were really one of these he might possibly have written his letter to Cecil with a desire to get a shelter for Cheney, and might, perhaps, himself the very same day have not inconsistently signed the Articles, including the 29th, if only we may suppose him to have said to Parker and the other Bishops—"Mind, I only understand the Article as applying to *re vera* reception and eating. The Fathers used very different language, and I with them speak of reception by the unworthy *sacramento tenus*,"—and may suppose Parker to have said to him in reply—"Certainly: we all understand it so. It is not meant to apply to receiving and eating *sacramento tenus*." (See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 253 b.)

I make this suggestion with diffidence, aware that there is somewhat in it open to question, aware also that Bucer would hardly have written quite as Geste wrote. It does, however, seem to me to harmonize with all we know of Geste, and to make something like a way out of the difficulties which beset this matter, even if it may seem to some to lead to difficulties of its own.

At any rate it is important to observe what a very different *setting* the "Real Objective" doctrine had in the Lutheran system and in that of the Ritualists.

The following extracts from the writings of Luther and Melancthon, will serve, I hope, to show how thoroughly the doctrine of the Real Corporal Presence was kept in restraint, and made to be (comparatively at least) powerless and harmless, by its very position in the Lutheran doctrinal system; and, as regards the matter of use and application, how little, in *that* system, it had in common with the teaching of the Ritualists of our day,—*"Cum ergo Sacramentum hoc voles accipere, potissima verborum erit cura, in quibus sentias eum thesaurum esse repositum, quo solo niti tuto possimus. Ad te enim sine dubio illa verba dicuntur: Meum Corpus pro vobis traditur, Meus sanguis pro vobis effunditur. In quem usum? num in hoc tantum, ut edas et bibas? non, immo in remissionem peccatorum tuorum. Hoc illud est, quod ad te potissimum pertinet, cui omnia reliqua, quæ hic fiunt et dicuntur, serviunt, ut tibi scilicet omnia tua peccata remittantur."* (Luther, "Concio de Confessione, etc.," A.D. 1519. In Works, tom. i., fo. 330, a. Jena, 1564.)

"Et itaque Missa, secundum substantiam suam, proprie nihil aliud, quam verba Christi prædicta, Accipite et manducate, etc. Ac si dicat: Ecce O homo peccator et damnatus, ex mera gratuitaque caritate, qua diligo te, sic volente misericordiarum Patre, his verbis promitto tibi, ante omne meritum et votum tuum, remissionem omnium peccatorum tuorum, et vitam æternam. Et ut certissimus de hac mea promissione irrevocabili sis, Corpus meum tradam, et sanguinem fundam, morte ipsa hanc promissionem confirmaturus, et utrumque tibi in signum et memoriale ejusdem promissionis relicturus. Quod cum frequentaveris, mei memor sis, hanc meam in te caritatem et largitatem prædices et laudes, et gratias agas." (Luther, "De Captivitate Baby: Eccles.," A.D. 1520. In Works, tom. ii., fo. 266. Jena, 1566.)

"Sic deinceps fere omnes promissiones aliquo signo firmavit, adeo ut hoc more Esaias juberet Achaz regem Juda, ut peteret signum a Domino promittente liberationem populi de manu regis Syriæ et Samariæ. Apud homines quoque pacta, promissa et fœdera non solum verbis et literis, sed additis aliquibus pignoribus aut testibus firmantur. Si verbis promittunt, stipulantur manibus, si literis, appendunt sigilla in robur facti et promissi. Ita ut hæc promissio divina nobis omnium esset certissima, fidemque nostram tutissimam redderet, apposuit pignus et sigillum omnium fidelissimum et preciosissimum, scilicet ipsummet precium promissionis, corpus et sanguinem proprium sub pane et vino, quo nobis emeruit promissionis divitias donari, quod et impendit, ut promissionem acciperemus. Quomodo ergo sacrificium et opus nostrum facere possumus ex pignore et sigillo Dei, nobis donato et promissioni suæ appenso?" (Luther, "De abroganda missa privata," A.D. 1521. In Works, tom. ii., fo. 454 a. Jena, 1566.)

"Cum autem quæritur ad quid prosit manducare, recte respondetur

prodesse ad confirmandam fidem, quia est testimonium, quo admoniti statuere debemus, vere ad nos pertinere beneficia Christi. Exhibet tibi Christus Corpus suum, ut donet tibi sua beneficia, ut testetur te esse membrum, pro quo passus est, quod velit servare, in quo velit esse efficax contra Diabolum." (Melancthon, "Catechesis Puerilis," in Works, tom. i., fo. 27 b. Wittemberg, 1562.)

"*Quis est fructus Sumptionis?* Usitate respondetur, quod sumptio fiat ad confirmandam fidem, videlicet ut applicentur credenti beneficia Christi, sicut supra dictum est, Sacramenta esse testimonia applicationis, quod necesse est intelligi, non ut Papistæ loquuntur, ex opere operato, id est, sine bono motu utentis in adultis, sed cum fide accipiunt. . . . Est igitur hic primus fructus, hoc testimonio confirmare fidem, et statuere, quod hoc tanquam pignore seu sigillo filius Dei se tibi applicare sua beneficia testetur, sicut et Paulus circumcisionem appellat Sigillum justitiæ." (Melancthon, "De Cœna Domini," in Works, tom. i., fol. 327 b. Wittemberg, 1562.)

"Sacramenta extra usum a Christo institutum non sunt Sacramenta, quia talis usus non habet verbum, et repugnat institutioni. Sicut . . . aqua baptismi non esset Sacramentum si transferretur ad alios usus extra verbum et institutionem. . . . Ita Missa in qua fit oblatio, et applicatur aliis, non servat institutionem Christi, quæ jubet non offerri pro aliis, sed manducari et bibi, corpus et sanguinem Domini, sed transfertur ad cultum alienum a verbo." (Melancthon, "De Missa Privata," in Works, tom. ii., fol. 193 b. Wittemberg, 1552.)

"Cum ergo patres Missam seu communem cœnam Domini (ut tunc servabatur) vocant sacrificium, ex ipsorum verbis facile poterit judicari, eos loqui non de oblatione et applicatione operis, sed de gratiarum actione seu memoria sacrificii seu mortis Christi." (Ibid. fol. 197 b.)

"Hæc sumptio est testimonium, quod Christus velit tibi et singulis applicari suum beneficium . . . Magna igitur consolatio est in hac sumptione. Scias sumptionem institutam esse, ut fides excitetur, et singuli credamus ad nos pertinere beneficium Christi." (Melancthon, "De Cœna Domini," in Works, tom. iii., p. 242. Wittemberg, 1563.)

"Hanc concionem hujus sexti capitis [Johan], nec de ceremonia cœnæ Domini, nec de manducatione ceremoniali intelligo, sed sicut supra Christus præfatus est, de fide, qua credimus placatam esse iram Dei morte filii, corpus suum offerentis pro nobis, et sanguinem suum fundentis." (Melancthon, "Annotationes in Evang.," tom. iii., p. 687.)

"Manducatio corporis et sanguinis Domini in nobis ipsis testimonium est, quod Christus vere nos sibi tanquam membra adjungat, quod vere velit nos ablueri sanguine suo. Sic igitur utendum est Sacramentis, sicut verbo, et fides exsuscitanda est et exercenda est Sacramentis, sicut verbo." (Melancthon, "In Epist. ad Rom.," cap. iv., tom. iii., p. 962. Wittemberg, 1563.)

"Concionatur Christus ipse inquit, *hoc facite in mei recorda-*

tionem. Vult enim nos retinere memoriam passionis et promissi beneficii; nec vult tantum historiæ memoriam conservari, sed vult, ut hæc beneficia in usu Sacramentis nobis fide applicemus . . . Semper autem de Sacramentis regula tenenda est, esse ea principaliter testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos seu gratiæ, Postea alii fines accedere possunt." ("Acta Ratisbonensia" in Melancthon's Works, tom. iv., p. 736. Wittemberg, 1564.)

Note F, p. 458.

The following passages are selected not only because, (1), they bear witness to the sense which was attributed to, and the use which was made of St. Augustine's sayings by our Reformers, but also because, (2), they will remove all doubt as to what is meant in the Article by the words "sign, or Sacrament." [See "Goode on Eucharist," i., 250, sqq.; and ii., 661, 664.]

"In the third [way] the *Sacrament* is eaten *without Him* [Christ]; and, therefore, it is called *Sacramental* eating only, because *only* the *Sacrament* is eaten, and not Christ Himself. . . . The third manner of ways the wicked do eat; and, therefore, as St. Augustine saith, 'they neither eat Christ's flesh nor drink His blood, although every day they eat the *Sacrament* thereof, to the condemnation of their presumption.'" (Cranmer, "On Lord's Supper," p. 205.)

"St. Augustine, in many places, plainly discussing this matter, saith, 'He that agreeth not with Christ, doth neither eat His body nor drink His blood, although, to the condemnation of his presumption, he receive every day the Sacrament of so high a matter.'

"And, moreover, St. Augustine most plainly resolveth this matter in his book, 'Dei civitate Dei,' disputing against two kinds of heretics. . . . St. Augustine, answering to both these heresies saith: 'That neither heretics, nor such as profess a true faith in their mouths, and in their living shew the contrary, have either a true faith, (which worketh by charity, and doth none evil,) or are to be counted among the members of Christ. For they cannot be both members of Christ and members of the devil. Therefore,' saith he, 'it may not be said that any of them eat the body of Christ. For when Christ saith, He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him; He sheweth what it is, (not Sacramentally, but in deed,) to eat His body and drink His blood: which is, when a man dwelleth so in Christ that Christ dwelleth in him. For Christ spake those words as if He should say, He that dwelleth not in me, and in whom I dwell not, let him not say or think that he eateth my body, or drinketh my blood.' These be the plain words of St. Augustine, that such as live ungodly, although they may seem to eat Christ's body, (because they eat the Sacrament of His body,) yet, in deed, they neither be members of His body, nor do eat His body. Also, upon the Gospel of St. John he saith, that 'he that

doth not eat His flesh, and drink His blood, hath not in him everlasting life; and he that eateth His flesh, and drinketh His blood, hath everlasting life. But it is not so in those meats which we take to sustain our bodies; for, although without them we cannot live, yet it is not necessary that whosoever receiveth them shall live; for they may die by age, sickness, or other chances. But in this meat and drink of the body and blood of our Lord it is otherwise. For both they that eat and drink them not have not everlasting life; and, contrariwise, whosoever eat and drink them have everlasting life.' Note and ponder well these words of St. Augustine: 'That the bread and wine, and other meats and drinks, which nourish the body, a man may eat, and nevertheless die; but the very body and blood of Christ no man eateth but that hath everlasting life;' so that wicked men cannot eat nor drink them, for then they must needs have by them everlasting life. And in the same place St. Augustine saith further: 'The Sacrament of the unity of Christ's body and blood is taken in the Lord's table—of some men to life, and of some men to death; but the thing itself, (whereof it is a Sacrament,) is taken of all men to life, and of no man to death.' And, moreover, he saith: 'This is to eat that meat, and drink that drink: to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling in him. And for that cause, he that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt he eateth not spiritually His flesh nor drinketh His blood, although carnally and visibly with his teeth he bite the Sacrament of His body and blood.' . . . By all these sentences of St. Augustine it is evident and manifest that all men, good and evil, may with their mouths visibly and sensibly eat the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood; but the very body and blood themselves be not eaten but spiritually, and that of the spiritual members of Christ, which dwell in Christ, and have Christ dwelling in them, by whom they be refreshed and have everlasting life. And, therefore, saith St. Augustine, that 'when the other Apostles did eat bread that was the Lord, yet Judas did eat but the bread of the Lord, and not the bread that was the Lord.' So that the other Apostles with the Sacramental bread did eat also Christ Himself, whom Judas did not eat. And a great number of places more hath St. Augustine for this purpose." (Cranmer, on Lord's Supper, pp. 210-213.)

"Ridley:—'Evil men do eat the very true and natural body of Christ *sacramentally*, and no further; as *St. Augustine* saith. But good men do eat the very true body, both *sacramentally*, and spiritually by grace.'

"Tresham:—'I prove the contrary by *St. Augustine*.' . . . And a little after, 'Because some eat not unto salvation, it followeth not therefore, that it is not His body.'

"Ridley:—'It is the body to them, *that is*, the *sacrament* of the body: and Judas took the *sacrament* of the Lord to his condemnation. *Augustine* hath distinguished these things well in another place, where he saith, The bread of the Lord, [and] the bread the

Lord. Evil men eat the bread of the Lord, but not the bread the Lord ; but good men eat both the bread of the Lord, and the bread the Lord.'” (Ridley’s Works, pp. 246, 247.)

“Watson:—‘The fathers say, that evil men do eat Him which descended from heaven.’

“Ridley :—‘ They eat Him indeed, but *sacramentally*. The fathers use many times the *sacrament* for the *matter* of the *sacrament*. . . . Evil men do eat the body of Christ *sacramentally*, but good men eat both the *sacrament* and the *matter* of the *sacrament*.” (Ibid. pp. 247, 248.)

“Chedsey :—‘ I will prove that the evil and wicked men eat the body of Christ, as well as good men by St. Austin here.’ And in the beginning of his test St. Austin seemeth to approve his assertion ; but I bade him *read out* to the *end*, and here St. Austin *declareth most evidently* that it was *quodam modo*, after a certain manner, the evil man received the body of Christ, which is *sacramentally* ONLY in the OUTER SIGN, and *not* REALLY or *in* DEED, as the good do. . . .’

“Chedsey :—‘ See how he would *writhe* St. Augustine’s words.’

“Philpot :—‘ See who of us *writheth* St. Austin more, you, or I which take his *meaning* by his own *express words*.’” (Philpot’s Examinations, p. 133.)

“*Malos non comedere carnem Christi ipsemet Christus testatur . . . Si quis cupit hac de re plura cognoscere, quod mali non comedant Corpus Christi, legat. . . . Augustinum De verbis Domini, Sermone xxxiii. tractatu in Joannem xxvi. . . . Et dicere etiam quod canes et mures, si externum signum sacramenti acceperint, quod una cum externo signo significatum (hoc est, corpus et sanguinem Christi) recipiant (ut dixi), plane impium est.*” (Hooper’s Works, ii., pp. 497-8.)

“This is the sum of the effectual talk we had ; besides which talk we had a reasoning a little, whether evil men did receive Christ’s body ; I NO, and he YEA. I said ‘they received not the Spirit, *ergo* not the body ; for it is no carcass,’ quoth I. *Hereto* I brought out St. Augustine how Judas received *panem Domini* and not *panem Domini* . . . which he went about to put away with *idem*, and not *ad idem* ; and how that ‘in corpore Christi’ was to be understood of all that be in the visible Church . . . which I *denied* to be St. Augustine’s meaning.” (Bradford’s Works, i., 542.)

Again, “They *eat not* Christ’s body. . . . And this doth St. Austin affirm saying, ‘None do eat Christ’s body, which is not in the body of Christ.’” (Ibid. p. 91.)

“By what testimony of the Scripture can this be proved, that Christ’s flesh is eaten unworthily, and unto damnation ? Paul saith, ‘He that eateth of this bread and drinketh of this cup of the Lord unworthily.’ He doth not say, ‘He that eateth Christ’s body unworthily, or drinketh His blood unworthily,’ which always be received to sanctification, to life, and salvation ; but, ‘He that eateth this bread ;’ that is, not common bread, not daily bread, but sacramental bread, that is meant by the word ‘this.’ Throughout the scriptures this

word 'unworthily' is never joined with Christ's body, never with His blood : for they do sanctify their receivers. *St. Austin also denieth this distinction*, . . . writing thus : 'He that abideth not in Christ, and in whom Christ abideth not, without doubt he eateth not Christ's flesh nor drinketh not His blood, although he eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing unto his damnation.' The holy father doth teach and confess here three things ; which things He teacheth likewise in many other places of his books. One is, that evil men do not eat Christ's flesh, for it is the bread of life and righteousness. Another is, that they do eat the *sacrament* and the *only figure* thereof. Thirdly, that they eat the said *only sacrament* and the *only figure* unto condemnation, making themselves, as Paul saith, 'guilty of Christ's body and blood' ; which they do not receive, because they will not believe." (Hutchinson's Works, p. 264. See also p. 265.)

"I will . . . prove . . . that Christ's body cannot be eaten of the wicked . . . St. Augustine saith, 'Qui non manet in Christo et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio non manducat carnem Christi, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, quamvis tantæ rei mysterium ad judicium suum manducat ac bibat.' . . . In like manner writeth Prosper, 'Qui discordat a Christo, nec carnem Christi edit, nec sanguinem bibit, etsi tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium suæ præsumptionis quotidie accipiat.' And therefore St. Augustine saith : 'Mali sacramentum habent, rem autem sacramenti non habent.' Thus . . . by the old fathers it is plain, that sinful men eat not the body of Christ, receive they the *sacrament* never so oft." (Grindal's Works, pp. 58-9.)

"That the wicked, ungodly and faithless people do not eat the body of Christ, nor drink His blood.

"Probations out of the old fathers. Augustine in Joan., Tract. 26, 'He that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt he eateth not spiritually the flesh of Christ, nor drinketh His blood, although carnally and visibly he eat the *sacrament* of the body and blood of Christ ; but he rather eateth and drinketh the sacrament of so high a thing unto his damnation.'" (Becon, Prayers, etc., pp. 462-3.)

"Notably is it said of St. Austin, 'That is a miserable servitude and bondage of the soul, to take the signs for the things signified, and not to be able to lift up the eye of the mind above the corporal creature, that it may receive the everlasting life.'" (Ibid. p. 435.)

"The wicked and unfaithful neither *eat* nor *drink* the *body and blood* of Christ, although they daily receive the *sacraments and signs* of them as *St. Augustine saith*." (Becon's Catechism, p. 292.)

"St. Augustine saith : 'They cannot be both the members of Christ and the members of an harlot. For he saith : He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him. Here doth he shew what it is, *not sacramentally* but *truly and effectually*, to eat the body of Christ, even to dwell in Him. He that dwelleth not in Christ, let him not say or think that he eateth the

body of Christ, forasmuch as he is not a member of His body. He is not a member of Christ, which maketh himself a member of an harlot.' Also in another place he saith: 'This is to eat that meat, and to drink that drink, even for a man to dwell in Christ and to have Christ dwelling in him. And therefore he that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt he neither eateth spiritually His flesh, nor drinketh His blood, *although carnally and visibly he bite the sacrament of Christ's body and blood.*' (Ibid. p. 293.)

Again, "The *ungodly* eat the *sacrament*; but they eat not Christ, which is signified by the Sacrament, as St. Augustine writeth of Judas." (Ibid. p. 294.)

"The Sacrament is received into our bodies, Christ's body is only received into our souls. For manifest proof of this difference, St. Augustine writeth thus:—'The *sacrament* of the body of Christ is . . . received from the Lord's table, of some unto life, of some unto condemnation. But the *thing itself*,' that is, the body of Christ, being in heaven, '*whereof it is a sacrament*,' is received of every man unto life, and of no man to condemnation.' . . . Again he saith, 'He that abideth not in Christ, nor hath Christ abiding in him, doubtless he *eateth not His flesh*, nor *drinketh His blood*, notwithstanding he eat and drink the *sacrament of so great a thing* unto his judgment.' By these few examples it is *plain* that the sacrament of Christ's body is one thing, and Christ's body itself is another thing: and that, in *common and natural* manner of speech, neither is Christ's body the sacrament, nor the sacrament Christ's body." (Jewel, Harding, Thess., etc., p. 759.)

It is to be observed, that whereas Augustine says only "the sacrament," the Article (as if to make it impossible to mistake the meaning) says "SIGN or sacrament." (See "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 664.)

Hooker says—"If that be separated which is secret, and that considered alone which is seen, as of necessity it must in all those speeches that make distinction of sacraments from sacramental grace, the name of a sacrament in such speeches can imply no more than what the *outward substance* thereof doth comprehend." (Keble Edit., vol. ii., p. 260.)

It is surely needless (with these extracts before us) to add anything as to the sense of the word *sacrament* in our Article.

But it may be well to mark how there is hereby distinctness added to the previous teaching of the Article. The Article not only makes a declaration as to what the wicked do not eat, but it declares also what they *do* eat. And it declares it to be *not* the *res sacramenti*, but the *sacramentum*; and that *sacramentum* the *symbolum*.

Let the reader be asked to mark carefully how the framers of our Article have dealt with the passage from St. Augustine.

(1) They left out "Spiritualiter," which was the very word they

should have been very careful to retain, if they had wished to teach the Real Objective Presence.

(2) They changed "*nec manducat*" in the body of the Article (though they retained it in the Title) into "*nullo modo* (in no way *whatever*) participates."

And (3) that there might be no room for mistake about the word "*Sacramentum*" (which in its ambiguity was sometimes used to signify much more), they explained it by "*symbolum*" (which admitted only of the *limited* sense of *sacramentum*).

It is impossible then, I submit, to question what the intention of the framers was. And if so, the question as to what St. Augustine's own doctrine was, is immaterial, though I cannot doubt that it was, in truth, the same as theirs.

The unprejudiced reader can hardly fail (I think) to observe the coherence and gradation of the teaching in Articles 28 and 29.

(1) First is answered the question—"What is the Lord's Supper?" And it is declared to be a Communion [or partaking] of the body and blood of Christ—yet with careful limitation to such as rightly, worthily, and *with faith* receive it.

(2) Secondly is answered the question as to the manner [*ratio*] of this communion or partaking, which, in reference to the words and acts of Institution, is spoken of as giving, taking, and eating of Christ's body. And the answer is, that it is ONLY *after an heavenly and spiritual manner*.

(3) Thirdly is answered the question as to the instrument by which man spiritually receives that which is thus only spiritually given and received. And the answer is, that the mean of the spiritual receiving and eating is faith.

(4) Fourthly is answered the question which arises—"How, then, is it with those who have no faith such as is required for this spiritual receiving and eating? There is given them, and they take and eat that which has been spoken of as the communion [or partaking] of Christ's body, yet they lack the instrument of spiritual receiving and eating; and it has been affirmed that there is no other way of receiving at all but spiritual,—does then the Sacrament fail to be to them a Communion [or partaking] of Christ's body, even while they eat the sign which bears the name of His body?" And the answer is—"Yes, such eat indeed (to their condemnation they eat the sign), but not Christ's body. Such partake indeed (carnally and visibly they partake of the Sacrament), but of Christ they are *no wise* partakers."

Compare the *Belgic Confession*:—[1] "*Nequaquam erraverimus dicentes, id quod comeditur esse ipsissimum Christi corpus naturale. . . .* [2] *At instrumentum, seu medium quo . . . comedimus non est os corporeum, sed spiritus ipse noster,* [3] *idque per fidem. . . .* [4] *Quamvis Sacramenta sint conjuncta rei ipsi significatæ: Ambæ tamen res istæ non ab omnibus recipiuntur. Malus enim recipit quidem Sacramentum in suam condemnationem, at rem, seu veritatem*

Sacramenti non recipit. . . . Solis enim fidelibus Christus communicatur." (See *Harmonia Confessionum*, 1581, p. 126.)

So also the later Helvetic Confession (see *Harmonia Confessionum*, pp. 109, 110, 111), in which the same order and gradation may be very distinctly traced.

THE REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE.

Questions suggested by the Judgment delivered by the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Phillimore, D.C.L. Official Principal of the Arches Court of Canterbury, in the case of the Office of the Judge promoted by Sheppard v. Bennett.

THE following Paper, somewhat hastily put together to meet the wishes of friends, and written with every respect for the ability and learning displayed in the judgment of Sir R. Phillimore, has relation—not (as the judgment) to particular formal statements, but—to a definite *Doctrine*; and aims at supplying such materials as may be useful to those who are seeking to be guided aright in what may be called the great controversy of our day, rather than at suggesting answers to certain portions of the judgment, which the writer cannot but regard as capable of misleading.

Personal considerations, special explanations, and particular modes of expression are therefore (however necessarily and rightfully prominent in the judgment) here out of view; and the one great question (all others being subservient) within the field of investigation is this—Does the Church of England sanction the teaching by her ministers of that doctrine which is now known as “The Real Objective Presence”? And thus, apart from all legal aspects, the inquiry comes to be regarded from a strictly theological standpoint.

The writer wishes it to be clearly understood that he is concerned with the judgment only so far as the judgment is concerned with the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. The questions are intended to bear upon the judgment only so far as the judgment bears, or may not unnaturally seem to bear, on this doctrine.

The questions will undoubtedly indicate the results to which the writer's own investigations have led him; but his desire is that these questions may be fairly and thoroughly sifted.

It is very sincerely hoped that there is nothing in this Paper which may be understood as designed to be in the slightest degree offensive, either to the learned Judge himself, or to any of those whose doctrine is commonly thought to be shielded by his judgment.

The subjects for investigation suggested by the judgment may be arranged under the following heads: (a) The Historical Notice. (b) The use of the phrase “Under the form of bread and wine.”

(c) The teaching of the 29th Article. (d) The Authority of Hooker. (e) The teaching of the 28th Article. (f) Sacrificial language. (g) The Black Rubric. (h) The teaching of the Catechism. (i) The teaching of English Divines.¹

(a)—QUESTIONS SUGGESTED BY THE HISTORICAL NOTICE.

I. Is it so that Bertram *taught unmistakeably* anything like the Real Objective Presence? ²

It is true that there are some passages in Bertram which look rather like it.

But is it not so that the same method of interpretation which would make Bertram teach a Real Objective Presence of Christ's *body and blood* must make him also teach a Real Objective Presence of *the people* in the elements?

And are there not other passages which can scarcely be reconciled with anything like the Real Objective Presence? ³

II. Was Bertram *universally understood* at the time of the Reformation as teaching anything like the Real Objective Presence?

If he was so understood—

(1) How comes it that his book was regarded by Papists as a forgery of Æcolampadius? ⁴

¹ On the interpretation of the Rubrics in the office of the Communion for the Sick, and its relation to the direction in the Salisbury Missal, and to the teaching of the Reformation, see *ibid.** pp. 267-271.

² For the sense of "Real Objective Presence" in text, see *ibid.* pp. 2-5. It may, of course, very well (as apparently in the judgment) convey much less than this.

It may be permitted, perhaps, to observe that the phrases "Objective Presence," "Objectively Present," are not altogether new in the Eucharistic controversy; but they are now used in a *new sense*, inasmuch as formerly they stood rather in opposition to "real" and "really"; e.g., (1) The Saxon theologians in 1530, "*Quod aliæ res, quia habeant loca dissita, tamen præsentés sint corpori non realiter, sed objective. Ita disputat tantum imaginariam esse præsentiam. Sed Bucerus decipitur hac imaginatione. Quia nunquam concedit realem et veram præsentiam.*" (See Hospinian, *Hist. Sacram.*, in Works, 1681, vol. iv., p. 183 b.) (2) Bishop Morton, "We say . . . the same body, as the same death; but it cannot be the same death, but *objectively only*. Ergo, can it not be the same body, but *only objectively*. Whereby it will be easy for us to discern the *subject* sacrifice of Christ from ours, His being the *real sacrifice* on the Cross, ours only the Sacramental Representation, Commemoration, and Application thereof." (On Eucharist, book vi., chap. 7, sect. 4, pp. 473, 474.) Compare p. 442, "The burial of Christ is not the *subject-matter* of baptism, but only the representative *object* thereof." Other examples might be adduced.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 275, 276, and Waterland's Works, 1843, vol. v., p. 206, also pp. 203, 204.

⁴ See references in *ibid.* p. 276; also Ridley's Works (Parker Soc. Edit.), p. 159, and Cosin's Works (A.C.L.), vol. iv., p. 199; also Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical

* *Ibid.* throughout refers to the "Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church concerning the Eucharistic Presence."

(2) How comes it that it was appealed to in support of their views (without any indication of their regarding his views as really erroneous) by Reformers whose views were unmistakeably opposed to anything like the Real Objective Presence? See e.g.:—

(a) Bullinger. "De Origine Erroris," Fol. 228-231. Zurich, 1539.¹

(b) Hooper. Early Writings, (Edit. Parker Soc.), p. 524. Later Writings, p. 405.

(c) Archbishop Grindal. Remains, (Edit. Parker Soc.), pp. 73, 74.

(d) Becon. Prayers, etc., (Edit. Parker Soc.), pp. 370, 371, 444-448 (where observe that the long extract from Bertram is brought in evidence "That the words of the Lord's Supper, that is to say, 'This is My body,' 'This is My blood,' are not properly, but figuratively to be understood," p. 435. See also pp. 449 and 469). Catechism, (Edit. Parker Soc.), p. 295 (where observe the quotation from Bertram is brought to confirm the assertion that "Faith is the mouth of the soul, wherewith Christ is received and eaten").

(e) Jewel. Sermon and Harding, (Edit. Parker Soc.), p. 458 (where observe in answer to Harding's assertion that "Berengarius was the first that began to sow the seed of the sacramentary heresy," Jewel answers, "One Bertramus, as appeareth by his book, held and maintained the same doctrine"), pp. 503, 546 (where observe Jewel argues from Bertram's words "Thus, as the bread is Christ's body, even so was manna Christ's body." See also "Harding, Thess.," etc., p. 577, and "Apology and

Biography, vol. iii., p. 312; and Edgar's Variations of Popery, p. 372. Woodhead, the Romanist, classes together "Bertram, Scotus Erigena, Berengarius," saying that the Reformed revived their arguments. (Rational Account, 1673, p. 59.)

Longuerue pronounces Bertram to be more Calvinistic than Calvin. (See Routh's Opuscula, vol. ii., p. 185); and Turrian, the Jesuit, asks, "Bertramum citare, quid aliud est, quam dicere, hæresim Calvini non esse novam?" (See Ussher's Works, vol. iii., p. 84.)

Jeremy Taylor explains Bertram's language (with that of St. Jerome and St. Clemens Alexandrinus), "calling it 'corpus spirituale,' the word 'spiritual' is not a substantial predication, but is an affirmation of the manner." (Real Presence, sect. i., § 11. Works, Edit. Eden, vol. vi., p. 19.) See also especially J. E. Cox, Protestantism and Romanism, vol. ii., pp. 216, 217; and Dissertation in Dublin Edition of Bertram, p. 84.

Is it not to be specially observed that in Bertram's language "under veils" is equivalent to "*figurative*" (p. 146), and "vail" is explained by "figure" (p. 143)?—that so also "mystery" is equivalent to "figure" (p. 143), and "in a mystery" is the opposite of "in truth" (p. 145)?—and that these expressions are applied not only to sacramental signs but (in the same way) to figurative or tropical sayings? (pp. 146, 147).

¹ See also R. Gualter, "Consensus Orthodoxus," 1605, pp. 120, 166, 260, 306. See also Hospinian, Works, 1681, vol. iii., pp. 251-269, especially p. 269 b. See also L'Aroque, History of Eucharist, Walker's translation, 1684, pp. 404-412.

Defence," p. 503.)¹ See also Jelf's edition of Jewel, vol. ii., p. 343; vol. iii., p. 107; and vol. v., pp. 102, 103.

(3) How comes it that it had been published at Cologne in 1532, and then sent by the Zurickers to Albert, Marquis of Brandenburg, to *vindicate their doctrine* from the charge of novelty? (See Gloucester Ridley's *Life of Ridley*, 1783, p. 165.)

(4) Why, when this was refuted, did they say that it was written by a follower of Berengarius? (See Gloucester Ridley's *Life of Ridley*, 1783, p. 170.)

(5) Why, when it was shown to be Bertram's, did they affirm that Bertram at that time began to be mad, and that he first *brought in question the Real Presence*? (See Gloucester Ridley's *Life of Ridley*, 1783, p. 171.)

(6) Why did the Papist, Gardiner (in disputation with Cranmer), speaking of Cranmer's *new doctrine* (as contrary to his Catechism, and opposed by Luther), say that "About seven hundred years ago, one Bertram, if the book set forth in his name be his, enterprised secretly *the like*, as appeareth by the said book, and yet prevailed not"? (Jenkyns's *Cranmer*, vol. iii., p. 42.)

(7) Why again did Gardiner say that the truth of the mystery of the corporal eating "was never impugned openly and directly that we read of before Berengarius, five hundred years past, and secretly by one Bertram before that"? (Jenkyns's *Cranmer*, vol. iii., p. 269.)

(8) Why again did Gardiner affirm that since Christ's time there was "no memory more than of six" that had affirmed the same doctrine as Cranmer, naming "Bertram, then Berengarius, then Wycliffe, and in our time, Æcolampadius, Zwinglius, and Joachimus Vadianus"? (Jenkyns's *Cranmer*, vol. iii. p. 307.)

III. Can then Ridley's claim of Bertram² afford any presumption of Ridley's holding anything like the Real Objective Presence?

Not, certainly, unless evidence is produced to shew that Ridley understood Bertram in another sense than other English Reformers.³

Is there evidence of any one English Reformer understanding Bertram in such a sense as to support the Real Objective Presence?

¹ See also Abbot "On the True Church," p. 90, and Gauden's "Suspiria," 1659, p. 310.

² It is worth observing how Ridley's appeal to Bertram (in *Works*, p. 159) is made on the very question between Æcolampadius and Melancthon, and in support of a doctrine which immediately before had been denounced by Fecknam (p. 158) as the doctrine of Berengarius, Wickliffe, Huss, Carolostadius and Æcolampadius. See also pp. 160, 161, 162.

³ Is not a strong presumption against Ridley's so understanding Bertram afforded by the fact, that on the very occasion of his declaring that he owed his views on the Lord's Supper to Bertram, he alleges Bertram's testimony in support of the proposition, that "A *figurative* sense and meaning is specially to be received in these words, 'This is My body'?" He says that of all the Fathers this appeareth *most plainly* in Bertram. (See Ridley's *Works*, pp. 205, 206.)

IV. Did Ridley hold anything like the Real Objective Presence? ¹

All passages from his writings adduced to prove that he did, admit of an easy solution.

This solution Ridley himself requires to be applied to them.²

Can any such solution be applied to many other passages which stand directly opposed to the Real Objective Presence? ³

V. Can then Ridley's influence with Cranmer be adduced as evidence of Cranmer's holding anything like the Real Objective Presence?

Cranmer himself attributed his changed views to intercourse with Ridley.⁴

But is it to be supposed that (in the usual sense of the word) his "erudition" on the subject was derived from Ridley? ⁵

¹ Ridley maintains that the words of Institution are to be understood figuratively (see especially Works, pp. 22, 243); ridicules the idea of the body of Christ being contained in the vessels at the Lord's table, *not* "as in a place, but as in a mystery" (Works, p. 33); argues from St. Augustine that we should "understand the manner of Christ's being here with us, which is by his grace, by his providence, and by his divine nature," adding, "he is absent by his natural body." (Page 43.)

Those who examine quotations made from Ridley in connection with their context will hardly wonder at Mr. H. B. Walton's speaking of Ridley as "traditionally reputed, *strange to say*, as the more Catholic among the Reforming Bishops." (Rubrical Determination of Celebrant's Position. Masters, 1870, p. 49.) After such a concession further evidence of Ridley's repudiation of the Real Objective Presence seems needless.

² When Ridley spoke of evil men *receiving* or *eating* the body of Christ *sacramentally* he used no language but what was common to other Reformers, whose repudiation of the Real Objective doctrine is commonly admitted (as, e.g., Bullinger, Decades, v., p. 466; Becon, ii., p. 294; Cranmer, on Lord's Supper, p. 205). And that he meant by these words (as they did) the reception of the external sacrament only (to the exclusion of "the thing of the sacrament," or "the matter of the sacrament,"—the *res sacramenti*) is clear from his words, "Evil men do eat the body of Christ *sacramentally*, but good men eat both the sacrament and the matter of the sacrament." (Works, pp. 247, 248.) Ridley insists that "the body" in language of St. Augustine, speaking of its reception by the wicked, means "the *sacrament* of the body." He explains such language by saying "The fathers use many times the *sacrament* for the matter of the sacrament." He adds, "This phrase to divines is well known, and used of the doctors; he tasted the flesh of the Lord 'insensibiler,' 'insensibly;' that is, the *sacrament* of the Lord's flesh" (p. 247). His rejection of the teaching of any *real* reception of the *res sacramenti* by the wicked is clear. See *ibid.* p. 34. On the sense of *sacramental* and *sacramentally*, see *ibid.* pp. 60-63.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 26-37; see also pp. 154, 155.

⁴ Did Archbishop Laud's notion, of Ridley's recovering Cranmer from "Zwinglian" tendencies, arise from a mistake (his memory serving him as to Ridley's influence on Cranmer, but failing him as to the *direction*); or is there any evidence anywhere of any such change of view for which Cranmer was (at any time) indebted to Ridley? The only reference given is to Foxe. (See Laud's Conference with Fisher, Edit. Oxford, 1839, p. 249. See also G. Ridley's Life of Ridley, Edit. 1763, p. 173.) Or did Laud misunderstand Cranmer's words, being misled by the previous assertion of Martin? (See Cranmer's Remains, P. S. Edit., p. 218.)

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 102, 103.

VI. Did Cranmer hold anything like the Real Objective Presence? ¹

If he did, what did he mean by the "Error of the Real Presence" which he had formerly been in? ²

If he did, what did he mean by saying that "Christ is not there [under or in the form of bread and wine] neither corporally nor spiritually"? (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 8.)

If he did, how came it that from the Second Book of Edward (in the framing of which his influence is acknowledged) the doctrine (as is acknowledged) was excluded?

If he did, what could he mean by saying that "the very body of the tree, or rather, the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the *Real Presence* of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Altar (as they call it), and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and dead; which roots, if they be suffered to grow again in the Lord's vineyard, they will overspread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions. These injuries to Christ be so intolerable that no Christian heart can willingly bear them"? (Ibid. p. 12.)

Again, what could he mean by saying "that Christ is present in His Sacraments, as they teach also that He is present in His Word. . . . This speech meaneth that He worketh with His Word, . . . as He useth also His Sacraments, whereby He worketh, and therefore is said to be present in them"? (Ibid. p. 319.)

Again, what did he mean by declaring "God's Word is clearly against you, not only in your doctrine of transubstantiation, but also in the *doctrine of the Real Presence*, of the eating and drinking, and of the sacrifice of Christ's flesh and blood"? (On Lord's Supper, pp. 333, 334.)

If he did, what did Ridley (who knew Cranmer and his writings well) mean, by repeatedly declaring that in England all learned men (as far as he knew) were agreed (in opposition to the Lutheran doctrine of Melancthon) that there is but one substance in the Sacrament? ³

VII. Can then Cranmer's influence on our Formularies be

¹ Can any statements be more distinct against anything like the Real Objective Presence than those of the "*Reformatio Legum*" as carefully prepared by Cranmer? Ibid. pp. 112-115.

"When A Lasco presented to Cranmer Bullinger's treatise *De Sacramentis*, the archbishop desired that it might be printed immediately, observing, that nothing of Bullinger's required to be read and examined previously." (Cardwell, Preface to Liturgies of Edward VI., p. xxx., note; see also p. xxix.)

So also Cranmer called Œcolampadius "that Godly and excellent learned man." (See Jenkyns's Cranmer, vol. iii., p. 267.)

That Cranmer did not hold the Real Objective Presence is admitted by Dr. Pusey and the author of "The Kiss of Peace." Ibid. pp. 10-11.

² Ibid. p. 184.

³ Ibid. p. 104.

adduced as evidence of their teaching anything like the Real Objective Presence?

Is there not abundant evidence that the Formularies of the Church of England at the close of Edward's reign were regarded by the Reformed as purged of every thing like the doctrine of the Real Presence? ¹

(b)—QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE USE OF THE PHRASE
“UNDER THE FORM OF BREAD AND WINE.”

I. Is the phrase “Under the form of bread and wine” authorized (as a strict doctrinal utterance) by the Church of England?

It was used in the list of titles, by which the Second Book of Homilies was promised. Was not the doctrine of the Church of England at that date in a transition state?

When the promised Second Book of Homilies appeared, was not the title of the Homily on the subject changed so as not to contain this phrase?

The Article authorizing the Homilies gives a list of the titles of the Homilies of the Second Book. Does the title of the Homily on the Lord's Supper there contain this phrase?

On behalf of the Communion Book of the Church of England, did not Cranmer repudiate the phrase? ²

II. Does the phrase “Under the form of bread and wine” necessarily imply the “Real Objective Presence”?

Was it not approved and used by J. Foxe and many others (whose repudiation of the Real Objective Presence is unmistakeable)—care being taken that it should not be misunderstood? ³

(c)—QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TEACHING OF THE 29TH
ARTICLE.

I. Does the 29th Article admit of being interpreted so as to deny only the “effectual” or “spiritual” reception and man-
education of Christ's body and blood?

(1) Was not the distinction between “Real” and “Effectual” Reception as urged by the Papists well known to our Reformers?

Was it not urged by Gardiner, repudiated by Cranmer? ⁴

¹ Ibid. pp. 45, 102-104; also pp. 461, 462.

² Ibid. pp. 142-147.

³ Ibid. pp. 146-165, and 182-185, 252, 253, 496.

⁴ The following is a brief extract from the words of Cranmer—“When this matter cometh in discussion among old writers, whether evil men eat Christ's body or no, if the truth had been that evil men eat it, *the old writers* would not so precisely have defined the contrary, that they eat not, but would have said, they eat it, but not effectually, not fruitfully, not profitably. But now *the authors which I have alleged*, define plainly and absolutely, that evil men eat not Christ's body, without any other addition.” (Ibid. p. 414.)

Was it not urged by Harding, repudiated by Jewel? ¹

Was it not urged by Campion, repudiated by Goode? ²

Was it not urged by Harpsfield, repudiated by Bradford? ³

(2) Has not the wording of the Article dealt with the passage from St. Augustine in a way which leaves no doubt of its intention?

Has it not *omitted* "spiritualiter"?

Has it not changed "nec manducat" into "nullo modo participes"?

Does it not explain "sacramentum" by "symbolum"? ⁴

(3) Is it not so that the sense of the Article depends not upon the sense of St. Augustine, but on the sense in which he was understood by the framers? ⁵

St. Augustine has been understood by some to deny only spiritual and effectual reception.

Do not his sayings appealed to in support of this view admit of easy solution, which solution is supplied by his own words?

Do his sayings appealed to against this view admit of any such solution?

(4) Is it not so that St. Augustine ⁶ was certainly understood by our Reformers as denying (not only "*spiritual*" and "*effectual*" but) all real reception by unbelievers? ⁷

(d)—QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE AUTHORITY OF HOOKER.

I. Is it not a mistake to regard what is called the Receptionist theory as anything like a peculiarity of Hooker? ⁸

Is not what is called the Receptionist theory, as stated by Hooker, stated also in the words of our Article (viewed in connection with context),—"insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ"? (Ibid. pp. 516-518; see also pp. 486, 487, 493, 494, 495, 498, 503, 504.) ⁹

Is there not rather a remarkable consensus on this point among Reformed Theologians, English and Foreign? (See e.g., Hall's *Harmony*, pp. 316, 322, 338.)

Not only was Hooker's teaching—as to its substance—no wise *new*,¹⁰ but even the language in which he clothed it varies little from

¹ Ibid. p. 412.

² Ibid. p. 412.

³ Ibid. p. 412.

⁴ Ibid. pp. 415, 517.

⁵ Ibid. pp. 453-459, 512-517.

⁶ Ibid. pp. 512-517.

⁷ On the subject of Jackson's language, see Appendix, Note A; and on Thorndike, see Appendix, Note B.

⁸ Ibid. pp. 214-218, 244-250, 486-505. It is not implied that the judgment gives *authority* to this view.

⁹ Is it not also clearly implied in the Black Rubric, inasmuch as the *highest* reason there given for kneeling is "for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the *benefits* of Christ therein given to all *worthy receivers*"?

¹⁰ The saying of Hooker will be found indeed to be substantially that which Gregory de Valentia states as the doctrine of the Protestants—"Although Christ

the expression of (1) Cranmer, "the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's body . . . and of His blood . . . be [he had said just before 'not corporally in the outward visible signs'] really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the Sacraments" (Ibid. p. 8); which again had been almost repeated by (2) Ridley, speaking of the "Spiritual partaking of the body of Christ to be communicated and given, not to bread and wine, but to them which worthily do receive the Sacrament" (Ibid. p. 27; see also p. 28); and again by (3) Bradford, confessing "a presence of whole Christ, God and man, to the faith of the receiver," but refusing to "include Christ's Real Presence in the Sacrament, or tie Him to it otherwise than to the faith of the receiver" (Ibid. pp. 50, 51); and declaring "I never denied nor taught, but that to faith whole Christ's body and blood was as present as bread and wine to the due receiver" (Ibid. p. 49); and again by (4) Philpot confessing "the presence of Christ wholly to be, with all the fruits of His Passion, unto the said worthy receiver" (Ibid. p. 46); and acknowledging "a Real Presence . . . to the worthy receivers, by the Spirit of God" while denying "in the Sacrament by transubstantiation any Real Presence" (Ibid. p. 47).¹

Yet it may be worth observing how Hooker's saying on this subject seems to be as something like a key-note to succeeding English Divines. It is adopted verbatim by (1) Bishop Field as from "that exact Divine Master Hooker." (Parasceve Paschæ, Edit. 1624, pp. 136, 137.) It is almost repeated by (2) Dr. Mayer, "not . . . that His body is in, under or about the bread . . . but faith making Him present unto the worthy receiver." (Catechism Explained, 1623, p. 527.) It may be said to be condensed in the famous dictum of (3) Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "present to our spirits only"² (Real Presence, Sec. I., § 8, in Works, Edit. Eden, vol. vi., p. 17—his interpretation of "*spiritually present*" in *our* sense); and to be

be corporally in heaven, yet is He received of the faithful communicants in this sacrament truly, both spiritually by the mouth of the mind, through a most near conjunction of Christ with the soul of the receiver by faith, and also sacramentally with the bodily mouth, etc.," (see Jeremy Taylor, in Works, vol. vi., p. 14, also Morton's Catholic Appeal, p. 127), and still more exactly to correspond to what Bishop Hall states as the doctrine of the Eucharist, "so much as touches the foundation," wherein "both parts do fully accord," viz., "That the body and blood of Christ are so truly present in the administration of the Sacrament, as that they are truly received by the worthy communicants, etc.," with which also agrees Bishop Davenant's statement, "*Fundamentale est, Christi Corpus et sanguinem ita vere adesse in administratione Sacramenti ut participari possint ad vitam inde hauriendam a communicantibus, et damnari juste possint qui panem et vinum ita sumunt ut non una sumant Christi carnem et sanguinem ad salutem suarum animarum. De hac nulla dissensio*" (Ad Fraternal Communionem Adhortatio. Edit. 1740, p. 132).

¹ See also Latimer's Remains, p. 64.

² The receptionist view was regarded by Bishop J. Taylor as "the doctrine of the Church of England, and generally of the Protestants." He says, "We, who best know our own minds, declare it to be so." (Ibid. pp. 204, 205.) So it was clearly regarded by Bishop Morton also. (Ibid. p. 488.)

expanded by (4) Dean Jackson when he says, "The sacramental bread is called His body, and the sacramental wine His blood, as for other reasons, so especially for this, that the virtue or influence of His bloody sacrifice is most plentifully and most effectually distilled from heaven unto the worthy receivers of the Eucharist." (On Creed, Book xi., chap. 5, in Works, Edit. Oxford, 1844, vol. x., p. 41.) The same note is struck by (5) Bishop Bayly saying, "Christ is verily present in the Sacrament, by a double union: whereof the first is spiritual, 'twixt Christ and the worthy receiver; the second is sacramental, 'twixt the body and blood of Christ and the outward signs in the Sacrament" (Practice of Piety, 1668, p. 442); and again, "The sacramental bread and wine, therefore, are not bare signifying signs, but such as wherewith Christ doth indeed exhibit and give to every worthy receiver not only His Divine virtue and efficacy, but also His very body and blood [which he had just spoken of as 'absent from us in place'] as verily, etc." (Practice of Piety, 1668, p. 445); and also by (6) Bishop Cosin, expressing (as his matured views) that "the body and blood is neither sensibly present, nor otherwise at all present but only to those who are duly prepared to receive them" (In Nicholls's Additional Notes, p. 49 a); and again, that "Christ in the consecrated bread ought not, *cannot* be kept and preserved to be carried about, because He is present only to the communicants" (Works, Edit. Oxford, 1851, vol. iv., p. 174); and again, that "indeed the body of Christ is given in the Eucharist, but to the faithful only" (History of Transubstantiation, Works, Edit. Oxford, 1851, p. 193). His view is commended by (7) Bishop Nicholson as Hooker's very pious judgment. (Exposition of Catechism, Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr., p. 215.) His saying is quoted by (8) Bishop Patrick, who makes it his own ("according as learned Hooker speaks." *Mensa Mystica*, Sect. 1, chap. 5. In Works, Edit. Oxford, 1858, p. 151. See also p. 150, "This is all that is meant by the real presence of Christ in this sacrament, which the Church speaks of and believes.") It may probably have suggested the language of (9) Bishop Ken, "present throughout the whole sacramental action to every devout receiver," which he substituted in the revised edition of his Exposition of the Catechism, as the correction or true explanation of the less guarded expression "present on the altar" as used in the first edition. (See Ken's Prose Works, Edit. Round, 1838, pp. 325 and 212.) It may also have suggested the language of (10) Dean Comber, "We desire they may be made the body and blood of Christ *to us*;¹ that although they remain in substance what they were, yet to the worthy receiver they may be something far more excellent . . . that we may become partakers of His most blessed body and blood." (Companion to Temple, Edit. Oxford, 1841, vol. iii., p. 260.) It is quoted (11) by Archbishop Wake, as from "the venerable Hooker . . . whose judgment having been so deservedly esteemed by all sorts of men,

¹ It may be observed, that Hooker's clear distinction (so far as it may be called Hooker's) between what the elements are "in themselves" and "to us" is found also (not to mention other names) in Laud and Thorndike. (Ibid. pp. 344, 345.)

ought not to be lightly accounted of by us." (In Gibson's *Preservative*, Edit. 1848, vol. x., p. 68.) It is virtually declared by (12) Archdeacon Waterland (as by Bishop Patrick) to be the doctrine of the English Church, saying, "The force, the grace, the virtue of Christ's body broken and blood shed, that is, of His passion, are really and effectually present with all them that receive worthily. This is all the Real Presence that our Church teaches."¹ (Works, Edit. Oxford, 1843, vol. iv., p. 42.)

II. Is it so that it was certainly not Hooker's intention to maintain that no other mode of the Presence could be lawfully holden by Clerks of our Church²—or rather, Is it so that the

¹ Compare also Bishop Morton's saying, "The spiritual *soul's* receiving of the body of Christ. Every faithful one indeed participating the same whole Christ." (On Eucharist, book iv., chap. 8, p. 280.) And Bishop Lake, "Our souls must 'take and eat and drink' the body and blood of Christ." (Sermons, "De Tempore," 1629, p. 173.) And especially Dean Aldrich, "When we say Christ is present, or adorable in the Sacrament, we do not mean *in the elements*, but *in the celebration*. . . . We do not hold that we barely receive the effects and benefits of Christ's body; but we hold it *really present*, inasmuch as it is really received, and we actually put in possession of it, though locally absent from us. . . . This, in short, is our meaning; and to this effect all true Church of England men declare it." (Reply to Two Discourses, quoted in Goode on Eucharist, i., p. 40.)

² Is there any evidence for this (beyond Walton's account of Hooker's friendship with Saravia) but the fact of his arguing against the making any definition of the mode of the Eucharistic Presence into an Article of faith, or a needless occasion of "so fierce contentions"?

But was not this the true position to occupy in opposition to the exclusive doctrine of Lutherans and Papists? See Hooker's MS. note as given in Keble's Edit., vol. ii., pp. 353, 354, "Because it is *false*, as long as they do persist to maintain and urge it, there is no man so gross as to think *in this case we may neglect it*." (Page 354.)

And was it not the position taken up by the Reformed generally? as *e.g.*—Frith—"Even as I say, that you ought not to make any necessary article of the faith of your part (which is the affirmative); so I say again, that we make no necessary article of faith of our part." (In Foxe's Acts and Mon., Edit. 1858, vol. v., p. 12; see also p. 14.)

A Lasco—"Illud tamen dicam, minorem mihi semper visam esse Sacramentarium hanc controversiam, quam ut propter illam Ecclesiæ Evangelium Christi profitentes scindi, alique ab aliis judicari, et diris omnibus debuerint devoveri." (Brevis et dilucida de Sacramentis Tractatio. London, 1552. Præfatio, B. 8 a.)

J. Foxe—"What cause is there then of discord, when they both, as I said, do confess the presence of Christ, and disagree only upon the manner of the presence, which the one part do affirm to be real, and the other spiritual?" (Acts and Monuments, vol. v., p. 11.)

The authors of the *Harmonia Confessionum*—"Omnes veram veri corporis, et veri sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi communicationem credimus. In modo communicandi hæret controversia. Sed quis propterea jure existimet Sacram Ecclesiarum Conjunctionem esse divellendam?" (Harm. Confess. Geneva, 1581. Præfatio, i., j.)

Bishop Field, advising to "consider by itself, what cause there is, why the *rest* in question [beyond 'that wherein all sides—both Protestants, and Papists, and Lutherans—do agree and consent'] should not rather be *rejected* as superfluous, than urged as necessary." (Parasceve Paschæ, 1624, p. 116.)

Real Objective doctrine was, in his view, certainly not excluded from the teaching of the Church of England? ¹

The following extract may go some way in answer: "Tell us not that . . . ye will read our Scriptures, if we will listen to your traditions; that if ye may have a mass by permission, we shall have a communion with good leave and liking; that ye will admit the things that are spoken of by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus, if your Lord and Master may have His ordinances observed, and His statutes kept. . . . He cannot love the Lord Jesus with his heart, which lendeth one ear to apostles, and another to false apostles; which can brook to see a mingle-mangle of religion and superstition, ministers and massing-priests, light and darkness, truth and error, traditions and Scriptures." (Hooker, Edit. Keble, vol. iii., p. 666.)

(e)—QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TEACHING OF THE 28TH ARTICLE.

I. Is it so that the words "given, taken, and eaten," in the 28th Article, imply the Real Objective Presence?

Are they not words of constant use in the language of the Reformation, applied to the same subject, and used by Divines most distinctly opposed to the Real Objective Presence? ²

II. Is it so that the letter of Geste gives any real support to the claim of an objective sense for the words "given, taken, and eaten"?

So also Bishop Nicholson (Exposition of Catechism, Edit. Angl.-Cath. Libr., p. 215).

So also Bishop Hall (Works, Edit. Pratt, 1808, vol. viii., pp. 54, 55).

Is it not the very danger of making such definitions into articles of faith, and the fact that such definitions have given occasion to many superstitions, which warrants our Church in requiring of her *clerics* that they shall not teach or hold such false doctrines at all?

The declarations of Articles 28 and 29 (understood in the natural sense) are no necessary barriers set up by our Church in the way of fraternal communion with foreign Lutheran churches (except so far as *they* may make them so), still less are they fences to narrow the limits of our own Communion; they are simply safeguards against false and dangerous teaching being heard from her own pulpits.

¹ It will hardly, I suppose, be questioned, that Hooker's great work may be said to have been written (generally) in support of the views previously maintained by Archbishop Whitgift (see in Keble's Edit., vol. i., pp. vi, 67. Vol. ii., pp. 1, 3). But Archbishop Whitgift had distinctly declared (with the sanction of Archbishop Parker) that the Church of England *has refused* the doctrine of "the Real Presence." (Ibid. pp. 19, 20.)

It is not, of course, intended to imply that Hooker must have agreed with all Whitgift's *obiter dicta*. But some presumption will arise that he did not differ from his statements in so material a point as this.

² Ibid. pp. 244-250, 486-505.

Does not the history of Geste's *two* letters show without doubt, that Guest's view was designedly rejected? ¹

(f)—QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO SACRIFICIAL LANGUAGE.

I. Is it so that the sacrificial language used, or the sacrificial doctrine maintained, by some eminent English Theologians, gives any real support to *that* sacrificial doctrine which is taught as a necessary part of the Real Objective Presence?

Ibid. p. 4.

II. Is there not rather a remarkable *consensus* among Divines of the English Church (including those who have most strongly defended such sacrificial language) in repudiating anything like the sacrificial doctrine of the Real Objective Presence?

Ibid. pp. 237, 238, 239, 297, 351-355, 358-364, 365, 366, 367, 368-370, 389, 390.

See also pp. 17, 18, 25, 35, 40, 41, 51, 52, 55, 59, 65, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 83, 92, 94, 95, 96, 98, 115, 125, 181, 183, 238.

See also Johnson's *Unbloody Sacrifice* (Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr.), vol. i., pp. 5, 251, 263, 266, 305, 306, 346, 347, 348, 350; vol. ii., pp. 13, 14, 15, 24, 25.

See also Hickes's *Treatises* (Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr.), vol. ii., pp. 107, 112 (note), 120, 128, 158, 160, 175, 182, 183.

See also Dodwell's *Discourse concerning the One Altar* (London, 1683), pp. 311, 312, 315, 357.

(g)—QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE BLACK RUBRIC.

I. Is it so that the change of the phrase "Real and Essential Presence" to "Corporal Presence" in the Black Rubric implies any change of doctrine?

Is it not so that the phrase "Corporal Presence" at the date of the re-insertion of the Rubric was commonly used to convey the same notion which at earlier date had been commonly conveyed by the phrase "Real Presence"? ²

Is it not so that the phrase "Real and Essential" could not have been retained in Rubric without a verbal condemnation of Jeremy Taylor and others, who had used the phrase "Real Presence" to signify the doctrine of those who rejected the Real Objective Presence?

¹ Ibid. pp. 445-452.

² Thus Dean Aldrich declares, "The Protestants in King Henry VIII.'s time, that suffered upon the Six Articles, denied the *Real Presence* (i.e., the Popish sense of it), but meant the same thing with us, who think we may lawfully use that term." (Reply to Two Discourses, quoted in Goode on Eucharist, i., p. 39.)

Is it not so that at the date of the re-insertion Protestants generally were agreed in maintaining a doctrine, which at that date was known as the "Real Presence"?¹

II. Is it so that the adoration claimed as due to the Real Objective Presence is not denied by this Rubric?

Even supposing there were any real and important doctrinal distinction intended between what was before called a "Real and Essential Presence," and what is now called a "Corporal Presence," how would such a "Real and Essential Presence" be more adorable for not being "Corporal"?

Ibid. pp. 305-311, 391-397.

See also pp. 398, 399.²

III. Is it so that such adoration receives countenance from the writings of any approved Divines of the English Church?

May it not rather be said that there has been a uniform denial of any such adoration by all Theological Schools among us, even those which have taught the highest Eucharistic doctrine?

Ibid. pp. 3, 32, 33, 59, 68, 71, 74, 77, 83, 84-87, 96, 305-311, 333, 379-382, 385-391.

See also Johnson's Works (Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr.), vol. i., pp. 345-351.

See also Hickes's Treatises (Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr.), vol. ii., pp. 159, 160.

See also (as regards Laud) Bulley's Variations, p. 183.

See also (as regards Cosin) Ibid. p. 385. See also especially Brevint as quoted pp. 380, 381.

(h)—QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TEACHING OF THE CATECHISM.

I. Is it so that the Catechism teaches anything like the Real Objective Presence?

In the language of the Reformation does the Catechism teach anything more than was the general teaching of Reformed Churches and Divines?³

In the language of the Reformation does not the word "faithful" exclude the Real Objective doctrine?⁴

II. Was any attempt made by the Puritans at the last Review, to get any change made in the answer of the Cate-

¹ Ibid. pp. 307, 391-397; and Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, Edit. Anglo-Cath. Lib., vol. ii., p. 4.

² See Appendix, Note C.

³ Ibid. pp. 197-213.

⁴ Ibid. pp. 230-235. As to argument derived from Overall's views, *ibid.* pp. 190-196.

chism which is now alleged to teach the Real Objective Presence?

Did not the Puritans take several exceptions to words of the Catechism, but none to the words of this answer? ¹

(i)—QUESTIONS AS TO THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH
DIVINES.

I. Is it so that a long roll of illustrious divines from Ridley to Keble have taught in our Church the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence?

Have not such lists as have been given, been found (under examination) to afford very little support to the Real Objective Presence?

AS TO THE CLAIM MADE FOR

- Andrewes, see Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 814-822 and 960; and *ibid.* pp. 393, 272; and Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's *Preservative*, 1848, vol. x., pp. 68-70, 87, 88.
- Bayly, see Goode, ii., pp. 919-923; and *ibid.* pp. 245, 488, 490, 491.
- Beveridge, see Goode, ii., pp. 856-859; and *ibid.* pp. 99, 411.
- Bilson, see Goode, ii., pp. 789-806; and *ibid.* pp. 68-71, 197, 379, 359, 360, 361, 368, 369.
- Bramhall, see Goode, ii., pp. 867-871; and *ibid.* pp. 239, 360, 379.
- Brett, see Goode, ii., pp. 939-942; and *ibid.* p. 301.
- Brevint, see Goode, ii., pp. 897-904; and *ibid.* pp. 192, 267, 380, 381, 227, 274.
- Bull, see Goode, ii., pp. 890-892; and *ibid.* pp. 360, 368, 369; and *Waterland's Works*, 1843, vol. v., pp. 190, 191.
- Burnet, see Goode, ii., pp. 670-676, 717, 718; and *ibid.* pp. 382, 387, 388.
- Comber, see Goode, ii., pp. 884-889; and Garbett's *Voices of the Church of England*, p. 58.
- Cosin, see Goode, ii., pp. 851-856; and *ibid.* pp. 168, 191, 237, 238, 351, 361, 353, 362, 368, 369, 385, 389; and Garbett's *Voices of the Church of England*, p. 74.
- Donne, see Goode, ii., pp. 879-883.
- Field (Bishop), see Goode, ii., pp. 877-879; and *ibid.* pp. 320, 321, and *Parasceve Paschæ*, 1624, pp. 135, 136.
- Field (Dean), see Goode, ii., pp. 839-841; and *ibid.* p. 172.
- Gauden, see his *Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Suspiria* (London, 1659), pp. 56, 86, 88, 302, 309, 310, 311.
- Grabe, see Goode, ii., pp. 962, 963, 965; and *ibid.* p. 300.

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 197-204, 240-244, 323. Does the change proposed in the reign of William and Mary weigh anything as evidence against this? At that date was there not a change beginning to come over the language (to say the least) of our English Theology.

- Hammond, see Goode, ii., pp. 926-932; and *ibid.* pp. 246, 247, 280, 336, 337, 340, 393.
- Herbert, see Goode, ii., p. 883; and *ibid.* p. 386.
- Hooker, see Goode, ii., pp. 822-826; and *ibid.* pp. 10, 11, 20, 87-93, 245, 246, 272, 320, 387, 392, 516; and Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. x., p. 68.
- Jackson, see Goode, ii., pp. 872-877; and *ibid.* pp. 229, 245, 249, 279, 280.¹
- Jewel, see Goode, ii., pp. 806-814; and *ibid.* pp. 77-87, 101, 106, 213, 238, 248, 249, 278, 507; and Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. x., p. 67.
- Johnson, see Goode, ii., pp. 942-945; and *ibid.* pp. 389, 390. See also Johnson's *Works* (Anglo-Cath. Lib. Edit.), vol. i., pp. 251, 263, 266, 305, 306, 346, 348, 350; vol. ii., pp. 24, 25; and Garbett's *Voices of the Church of England*, p. 55.
- Ken, see Goode, ii., pp. 892-896; and *ibid.* p. 99.
- Lake, see Goode, ii., pp. 835-839; and *ibid.* pp. 227, 229, 246, 248, 249, 273.
- Laud, see *ibid.* pp. 237, 238, 345, 393, 394; and Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. x., p. 71.
- L'Estrange, see Goode, ii., pp. 938, 939; and *ibid.* pp. 315, 316, 385, 393.
- Mede, see *ibid.* pp. 345, 352, 354.
- Morton, see Goode, ii., pp. 831-835; and *ibid.* pp. 167, 168, 169, 278, 279, 333, 360, 365, 366, 369, 370, 379, 441, 442, 453, 393, 488.
- Nelson, see Goode, ii., pp. 932-935; and Garbett's *Voices of the Church of England*, p. 60.
- Nicholls, see Goode, ii., pp. 937, 938; and *ibid.* p. 332; and Garbett's *Voices of the Church of England*, pp. 53, 57, 74.
- Nicholson, see Goode, ii., pp. 702-704; and *ibid.* pp. 161, 162, 247, 395; and especially his *Exposition of Catechism* (Engl. Anglo-Cath. Libr.), pp. 233, 234.
- Overall, see Goode, ii., pp. 927-930; and *ibid.* pp. 190-196.
- Patrick, see Goode, ii., pp. 859-864; and *ibid.* pp. 163, 223, 273, 274, 354, 355.
- Pelling, see Goode, ii., pp. 945-949.
- Ponet, see Goode, ii., pp. 777-787; and *ibid.* pp. 41-43, 116-119.
- Ridley, see Goode, ii., pp. 765-768; and *ibid.* pp. 26-37, 48, 60, 61, 104, 116, 154, 155, 392, 464, 513, 514, 328; and Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. x., pp. 63, 64.
- Secker, see *ibid.* pp. 219, 220, 281, 349, 387.
- Sharp, see Goode, ii., pp. 952-955; and *ibid.* pp. 248, 278, 281, 346, 347, 361, 367; and Garbett's *Voices of the Church of England*, p. 59.
- Sherlock, see Goode, ii., pp. 702, 864-867; and *ibid.* p. 165; and Garbett's *Voices of the Church of England*, p. 77.
- Sparrow, see Goode, ii., pp. 838, 839; and *ibid.* p. 375.
- Sutton, see Goode, ii., pp. 923-926.

¹ See Appendix, Note A,

- Taylor, see Goode, ii., pp. 842-851, 914; and *ibid.* pp. 62, 86, 88, 102, 158, 204, 216, 229, 392, 393, 454; and Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. x., pp. 88, 72, 73; and Garbett's *Voices of the Church of England*, p. 52.
- Thorndike, see Goode, ii., pp. 904-908, 961, 962; and *ibid.* pp. 344, 345, 362, 469.¹
- Wake, see Goode, ii., pp. 910-916; and *ibid.* pp. 266, 311, 333, 383, 393; and Garbett's *Voices of the Church of England*, p. 90.
- Warburton, see Goode, ii., pp. 949-952; and *ibid.* p. 502.
- Wheatly, see Goode, ii., 938, 939; and *ibid.* p. 317.
- Wilson, see Goode, ii., pp. 935-937; and Garbett's *Voices of the Church of England*, p. 59.
- Yardley, see Goode, ii., pp. 908-910.

Of a very small proportion of these, it is simply maintained, that their language, fairly examined, will be found to afford no sufficient evidence of² their holding the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence.

Of by far the larger number, it is believed that it may be very safely maintained, that their language will be found to afford satisfactory evidence that they did not hold anything like the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. Of these, it is not denied, that some held Eucharistic views differing from that of our Reformers, some (Non-jurors)³ confessedly not that of the English Church. (See Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 939, 961, 965; *ibid.* pp. 401, 366, 300.)

Saravia's name is omitted from the list. He was not an Englishman by birth or education. It is, however, admitted that his work on the Eucharist would have yielded some support to the Real Objective Doctrine, if it had ever been published with the *imprimatur* of an English Archbishop.⁴ But if this be the *single* exceptional case,

¹ See Appendix, Note B.

² It is believed that if any exception has to be made it is the case of Thorndike. It is submitted, however, for consideration, whether the extracts given below (pp. 544-548) will not, at least, warrant a verdict of "not proven." Certainly Waterland did not understand his language to imply any such doctrine, as will be seen from the following extract:—

"I have omitted Mr. Thorndike, because his notion [of the Sacrifice] plainly resolves itself into the *passive* sense, viz., into the *grand sacrifice* itself, as contained in the Eucharist, because *represented*, *applied*, and participated in it. The Lutherans, generally, resolve it in the same way, only differing as to the point of *real* or *local* presence." (Waterland's Works, Edit. Oxford, 1843, vol. v., p. 139, note.)

As to Forbes (Bishop of Edinburgh) see Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's *Preservative*, 1848, vol. x., pp. 71, 89; and Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 871, 872.

³ To these may be added Grabe, who (not an Englishman by birth or education) seems to have been quite sensible of the difference between his own Eucharistic doctrine, and the teaching of our English Liturgy. (*Ibid.* pp. 300, 345; and Lathbury's *History of Non-jurors*, pp. 278 note, 301.)

It would appear also that Thorndike was quite sensible that the teaching of our Communion Service falls short of his own view, though he did not (as the Usagers) regard it as deficient in essentials. See Works (Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr.), vol. i., pp. 379, 380, 382; vol. v., pp. 53, 54, 241, 245, 246, 324; vol. vi., p. 218.

⁴ Let it, however, be submitted for consideration, where there has not been some little misunderstanding with reference to Saravia—whether it has been sufficiently

the fact that the work, prepared for publication, was never published, must surely be acknowledged to throw no light weight into the opposite scale.

II. Might it not rather be said that among divines of the Reformed English Church from Cranmer and Ridley till the present century there has been (other differences notwithstanding) a remarkable *consensus* of separation from anything like the Real Objective Presence?

Did not Laudian Theology reject it? ¹

Did not Non-jurors repudiate it? ²

Passages indeed may (no doubt) be quoted from English divines,

noted that his work is not written so much in the interests of strict Lutheran views—or of the Real Presence of Luther in opposition to the Reformed—as of those views of pacification which aimed at establishing a harmony between the views of the Swiss and the Saxons (see Denison's *Saravia*, pp. 5, 15, 141, 143, 145), on the basis of the *Concordia Witebergensis* (see pp. 5, 6, 17, 123, 125, 127). Does it not appear that *Saravia* was one of those who, believing that Zuingli and *Ecolampadius* (see pp. 131, 143, 145, 151) differed from Luther in words rather than in doctrine (see pp. 35, 120), in the use of language rather than in what was meant to be conveyed by that language (p. 120), desired to use and to defend the language alike of Lutherans and Reformed? (See pp. 17, 75, 151, 89.) May it not be said (though doubtless *Saravia* goes further than Bucer in the use of Lutheran language) that he is more nearly a follower of Bucer than of Luther? (See pp. 35, 121, 151.) Might not his views, possibly, be classed rather with those of Bp. Davenant, Bp. Bedell, and Bp. Hall, than with those of the Ritualists? (*Ibid.* p. 508. See also pp. 480, 500, and 505, sqq.; and Bishop Hall's Works, Edit. Pratt, 1808, vol. viii., pp. 54, 55.)

His abomination of the idolatry of the Mass is plain (p. 5), so also is his teaching that the *res sacramenti* is not the flesh of Christ "simpliciter," nor the flesh in glory, nor the blood that which belongs to the glorified body, but the flesh crucified, and the blood that which flowed from the wounds. (Pages 41, 43, 47, 51, 55.)

So also is his rejection of reservation and adoration (pp. 55, 123). So also is his teaching of the same presence of Christ's blood in baptism (p. 105. See also pp. 77 and 111). So also is his approval of the teaching that the Presence is only in the use and taking of the Sacrament (p. 123. See also p. 77).

And may not very much the same be said of the *Diallecticon*, which was certainly not Ponet's and as certainly does not teach anything like the full doctrine of the Real Objective Presence? (*Ibid.* pp. 43, 44; and Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 779-782.)

Is it not also important to be remembered that even the strictest Lutheran theology would have been most strongly opposed to the (so-called) Catholic doctrines which are now taught as a part of the teaching of the Real Objective Presence? (*Ibid.* pp. 110, 508, 510, 511, 512.)

¹ See references under names given above; and *ibid.* pp. 237-240.

² See references above; also Lathbury's *History of Non-jurors*, pp. 316, 335, 336, 378, sqq.; and Williams's *Orthodox and Non-jurors*, Introduction, p. xxxiii.; and *ibid.* pp. 300, 301; and references to Johnson, Hickes, Dodwell, etc., as given above, in p. 531.

Dr. George Hickes distinctly teaches that the bread and wine are made to be the body and blood of Christ, "by Divine fiction,"—"fictions in Divinity" being compared to legal fictions of the civil law. (See *Treatises*, Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr., vol. ii., pp. 159, 160.)

which (taken alone and unexplained) may, with some plausibility, admit of having such a sense given to them.¹

¹ A very fruitful source of misunderstanding in such passages appears to be the ambiguity of the words "sacrament," "sacramental," "sacramentally." The following questions are suggested to assist in investigation:—

(1) Did any of our Reformers or their successors ever deny that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are received and eaten by the faithless *sacramentally*?

(2) Did any one of them ever maintain that by such they were received and eaten *really*?

(3) Did any of them ever deny the distinction between *sacramental* and *real* reception and eating? or maintain a distinction between real and effectual eating?

(4) Did any one of them ever maintain that the *sacramental reception* and *manducation* of the body of Christ by the faithless meant the *real* reception and manducation of anything more than the *outward sacrament* or *sign* of it?

(5) Did not our Reformers clearly maintain that the guilt of unworthy reception consisted not in the unworthy reception of the *res sacramenti*, but in the *not receiving* of the *res sacramenti* with the *sacramentum*, to which it is sacramentally united?

(6) Did any of our Reformers or their successors (not including under this name Geste or Cheney) ever oppose this teaching, or maintain the contrary? [Not including also the Dialecticon which has so commonly, in error, been attributed to Ponet. See Goode, on Eucharist, ii., pp. 779-782.]

On this subject see *ibid.* pp. 59-63, 100-102, 152, 153, 422, 423, 424, 425, 441, 442, 453-455, 458, 512-516, 476, 477; and on the Sacramental Union see A Lasco, *De Sacramentis*, 1552, fol. 14 b; Hall's *Harmony*, pp. 324, 337; *Consensus Orthodoxus*, 1605, p. 323; Hospinian, *Works*, 1681, vol. iv., pp. 265, 282; and *ibid.* pp. 319, 320.

Hooker says: "If that be separated which is secret, and that considered alone which is seen, as of necessity it must be in all those speeches that make a distinction of sacraments from sacramental grace, the name of a sacrament in such speeches can imply no more than what the *outward substance* thereof doth comprehend." (Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.*, book v., chap. lviii., 2; Edit. Keble, vol. ii., p. 260.)

Bishop Gauden says of the ancient Fathers and Councils, that "though highly and justly magnifying the great mystery, yea, and the elements consecrated, as related to and united with the body of Christ, as signs and seals of its reality, truth, use, and merit to a sinner; yet generally they held them to be substantially and physically bread and wine, but sacramentally, relatively, or representatively (onely) the body and blood of Christ." (*Suspiria*, 1659, p. 310.)

But though, in such phrases as "sacramentally present," "sacramentally received," "received in a sacrament," and the like (as distinguished from "really received"), there remains in the meaning of *sacrament* nothing but *outward substance* or *symbol*, and in the meaning of such reception the real receiving of nothing but the outward sign, it must not be forgotten that (in the language of our Reformers) the words "sacrament" and "sacramental" and "sacramentally" never cease to connote that relationship (by Christ's institution) to the *unseen gift*, the *res sacramenti*, which must needs cause that the receiver cannot have *nothing to do* with the *res sacramenti*. In receiving the *sacrament* he must either by the reception of faith be *partaker* of the body and blood of Christ, or by the rejection of unbelief be *guilty* of the body and blood of Christ. (*Ibid.* pp. 62, 101, 102, 152, 319, 320, 321, 486, 508, 514, 509; and Westminster Confession, ch. xxix., § 5, Edit. 1658, p. 99.)

Is not this teaching consistently maintained by Reformed Theologians, as expressed by Bishop Davenant in the extract quoted above, p. 527?

And is there anything really beyond this taught, in the language (adapted, no doubt, to the prominent *virtualism* of his doctrine) quoted (in the judgment) from Dean Jackson, as candidly interpreted in connexion with the whole tenor of his doctrine? See below, pp. 539-543.

But may not the same be said also of the writings of the Puritan divines? ¹

And has it not been seriously maintained that a Hymn Book of the Independents teaches the Real Objective Presence with the utmost possible distinctness? ²

It must not be supposed that this distinction between *sacramental* and *real* Presence and Reception has place only in some few of our earlier Reformers and their *immediate* successors. It is *very clearly* marked and strongly insisted on, *e.g.* in Bishop Morton (On Eucharist, Book V., Ch. ii., Sect. i. 8 and 9, Edit. 1635, pp. 312, 322, 323, 324, 325. Ibid. pp. 441, 442), in Jeremy Taylor (ibid. p. 454). It is clearly seen also in Bishop Field (see Parasceve Paschæ, 1624, pp. 210, 212). And it must be acknowledged to find place also in the writings of Dean Jackson (see Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 873, 874, and below, pp. 539, 540), though, it may be, in a sense modified, to some extent, by the prominence of certain features characteristic of his teaching. It has place also in Bishop Nicholson (see his Exposition of Catechism, A.C.L., p. 216 b) and in Mayer (on Cat. 1623, p. 527).

With Thorndike also, is it not so, that his use of the expressions "sacramental," "*sacramentally*," "in the sacrament" ["sacramental Presence," "sacramentally present," "sacramentally the body and blood of Christ," "Body and blood of Christ sacramentally, that is to say, as in the Sacrament," "receive it in the Sacrament," "eating the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament," "Body and blood of the Eucharist"] imply an *abatement* in the meaning of that to which they are applied [as he says, *e.g.* "cannot be said to eat . . . without that *abatement* which the premises have established, to wit, *in the Sacrament*"], which "*abatement*" (as it seems from his other teaching) must deduct all *that is real* in the sense of the Real Objective Presence? (See Goode on Eucharist, ii., 904-908, and ibid. p. 469, where I may have not quite accurately expressed myself.)

It is not, however, denied that Thorndike's language presents some difficulties peculiarly its own, and that such expressions in his writings have a sense which they acquire from the acknowledged peculiarity of his doctrine. (See below, pp. 543-548.)

¹ Ibid. pp. 98, 211, 212, 213, 214.

² See Ecclesia, pp. 352, 353.

APPENDIX.

Note A, pp. 526, 534.

It is very willingly admitted that Dean Jackson has used language which is (to say the least) somewhat incautious, and (if viewed apart from the pervading character of the surrounding doctrine) quite capable of a less favourable interpretation. Yet it must not be too hastily inferred that there is any real contrariety between his Eucharistic doctrine and that of our earlier Reformed Divines. And in the examination of his teaching, with the view of discovering whether or not his language will render any real support to the modern interpretation of our Article 29, the reader must be asked carefully to enquire—

(1) Whether he used the expression "*eating sacramentally*" and the like in the Real Objective, as opposed to the Reformed sense (*ibid.*, pp. 60-62, and above, pp. 523, 537, 541), or in the Reformed, as distinguished from the Real Objective sense—only with a marked prominence given to the idea of the consecrated relationship of the sign to the thing signified and exhibited by it, and of the virtue or influence—by reason of that relationship—accompanying the reception. (*Ibid.*, pp. 62, 319, 320, and above, p. 528.)

(2) Whether there be not a strong presumption afforded in favour of his using such expressions in the Reformed (as clearly distinguished, at least, from the Real Objective) sense, from

(a) His words "*all agree that there is a twofold eating of Christ's body . . . one merely sacramental, and another spiritual.*" (Works, Oxford Edit., 1844, vol. x., p. 51.)

It may be observed that the saying (exactly corresponding to those alleged from Jackson), "Evil men eat the body of Christ, but sacramentally, and not spiritually," is set down among the "Concessa" gathered out of Gardiner's sayings (in Cranmer's Works, P. S. Edit., vol. i., p. 384).

Compare Cranmer's own words, "The good eating it [the body] both sacramentally and spiritually, and the evil only sacramentally, that is to say, figuratively." (Vol. i., P. S. Edit., pp. 224, 225.)

(b) His appeal to Beza's authority as to the relation of John vi. to "sacramental eating." (Works, vol. x., p. 54.)

(c) His supporting his view by the authority of Calvin—"As Calvin excellently observes . . . 'to eat Christ's body . . . *sacra-*

mentally, is more than to believe in Christ, more than to have our faith awakened or quickened by the sacramental pledges.'" (Works, vol. x., pp. 62, 63.)

(3) Whether there is not good evidence of his using them in such a Reformed sense, in his words "unless this virtue do as immediately reach our souls as it did her body—we do *not really* receive His body and blood with the elements of bread and wine; we do not so receive them as to have our sins remitted or dissolved by them." (Vol. ix., p. 610.)

(4) Whether there be not further evidence of this from the fact that the whole drift of his teaching shows that (while he thus distinguishes *real* and *sacramental* reception) he knows and allows no distinction between *real* reception (in his sense) and *effectual* reception, nor between *real* and *effectual* presence (in his sense) of the body and blood of Christ.

(5) Whether there be not yet further evidence of this from his saying—"Faith is the *mouth* or *organ* by which we *receive the medicine*; but it is the virtual influence derived from the body and blood of Christ which properly or efficiently doth cure our souls, and dissolve the works of Satan in us." (Vol. ix., p. 611.)

(6) Whether there be not yet further evidence of this from his saying—"Faith then is as the *mouth* or appetite by which we *receive this food of life*, and is a good sign of health; but it is the *food itself received* which must continue health, and strengthen spiritual life in us; and the food of life is *no other* than *Christ's body and blood*, and it is our High Priest Himself which must give us this food." (Vol. ix., p. 594.)

(7) Whether there be not yet further evidence in the same direction arising from the following words (interpreted by his other teachings, especially the quotation given above in p. 528)—"All that are partakers of this sacrament eat Christ's body and drink His blood sacramentally; that is, they eat that bread which sacramentally is His body, and drink that cup which sacramentally is His blood, whether they eat or drink faithfully or unfaithfully." (Vol. x., p. 51.)

(8) Whether this evidence be not confirmed by the clear opposition of his teaching to anything like the Real Objective Presence, as *e.g.*—

(a) His saying, "More than Calvin doth stiffly maintain against Zuinglius and other sacramentaries, cannot be inferred from any speeches of the truly orthodoxal or ancient fathers." (Vol. ix., p. 598.)

(b) His saying, "This distillation of life and immortality from His glorified human nature, is that which the ancient and orthodoxal Church did mean in their figurative and lofty speeches of Christ's real presence, or of eating His very flesh, and drinking His very blood, in the Sacrament." (Vol. x., p. 41.)

(c) His saying, "Now when we say that Christ is really present in the Sacrament, our meaning is, that as God He is present in an

extraordinary manner, after such a manner as He was present (before His incarnation) in His sanctuary." (Works, vol. x., pp. 52, 53.)

(d) His saying, "No man can spiritually eat Christ, but by believing in His death and passion." (Vol. x., p. 63.)

(e) His saying, "Christ's body and blood are so present in the Sacrament, that we receive a more special influence from them in use of the Sacrament," etc. (Vol. x., p. 63.)

(f) His saying, "With whomsoever He is virtually present, that is, to whomsoever He communicates the influence of His body and blood by His Spirit, He is really present with them, though locally absent from them." (Vol. ix., p. 610.)

[It is to be observed that Jackson uses the expression "*local presence*," not at all as distinguished from a Presence "there" *under the form of bread and wine* after a supra-local manner, but as distinguished from that *virtual* Presence, which, in his view, is the true "Real Presence."]

(g) His saying, "The same virtual presence . . . only that sweet influence which daily issueth from this Sun of righteousness. . . . This manner of Christ's presence, of His real presence in the Sacrament, to wit, by powerful influence from His humanity, our Church did never deny." (Vol. x., p. 261.)

(h) His saying, "We further add, 'For Christ's body, or whole Christ God and man, to be bodily present by this means [*i.e.* by God's creating the self-same body] in many places at once, or in all places at all times wherein that blessed Sacrament shall be celebrated, is one of those things, which, according to their rules as well as ours, cannot be done, as implying an evident contradiction in nature: 'it may not be believed nor imagined, because God did never bind any man to believe such an *impossibility* or *contradiction* as is involved in this doctrine. It is altogether without the compass of the most miraculous work which God hath at any time wrought, or ever promised to work.'" (Vol. x., p. 256.)

(i) His saying, "The Romish priests had made a gainful prey by transporting the native sense of our Saviour's words in the institution to justify the doctrine of transubstantiation. And since they have been pursued by Reformed writers, as cozeners and cheaters of God's people, some of them run one way, and some another; some of them seek to maintain Christ's *local presence*, or transubstantiation, by the former doctrine of God's Almighty power, which is able to create one and the same body often: others seek to maintain the same doctrine, and carry away the prey by the manner of angelical motion from one place to another in an instant or moment of time. And if they could draw such as pursue them into these straits and subtilties, they hope to make their part good against such as are not much conversant in the Schoolmen's nice disputes concerning the nature or motions of angels, or know not the difference between the nature and motions of spirits and spiritual bodies. Others seek to maintain the same doctrine by the infinity of divisible quantities (as if it were possible for a fly's wing to overspread the whole earth, as a hen doth

her chickens), and that Christ's body may, by this kind of infinity, be in many places at once, in as many as God shall appoint: hoping by this means to cast a mist before the eyes of such readers as know not the difference betwixt real material or substantial, and a mathematical or imaginary quantity. But all these fictions or suppositions they cast forth only to offer play unto their adversaries." (Vol. x., p. 258.)

(j) His saying, "To believe Christ's flesh and blood should be there present where it cannot be seen or felt, yea where we see and feel another body as perfectly as we can do aught, is to reason, without warrant of Scripture, but a senseless blind belief. But grant His body and blood were in the Sacrament rightly administered, yet that out of the Sacrament either should be in the consecrated host whilst carried from town to town for solemn show more than for sacramental use, is to reason ruled by Scripture (to say no worse) more improbable. Now to worship that as God, which to our unerring senses is a creature, upon such blind supposals, that Christ's body, by one miracle may be there—by another, unseen—is worse than idolatry committed upon delusion of sense. So to adore a wafer, only a wafer in appearance, without strict examination, nay without infallible evidence of Scripture urged for the *real presence*, is more abominable than to worship every appearance of an angel of light, without trial what spirit it were—Satan or some other—that so appeared. And if we consider the old serpent's usual sleight to insinuate himself into every place, wherein inveterate custom or corrupt affection may suggest some likelihood of a Divine presence unto dreaming fancies (as he did delude the old world in oracles and idols), the probability is far greater his invisible substance (by nature not incompatible with any corporeal quantity) should be *annexed* to the supposed host, than *Christ's real body*, incapable for anything we know of joint existence in the same place with any other." (Vol. ii., pp. 207, 208.)

(k) His saying, "Sense doth witness that Christ is not, no Scripture doth warrant us that He or any other living creature, unless perhaps worms, or such as spring of putrefaction, is present, in their processions. Notwithstanding all the express commandments of God brought by us against their practice, the Trent Council accurseth all that deny Christ's *real presence* in procession, or condemn the proposal of that consecrated substance to be publicly adored as God; not so much as intimating any tolerable exposition of that commandment, which forbids us to have any gods but one." (Vol. ii., p. 210.)

(l) His saying, "If my conjecture fail me not, the dreaming fancy of a daily propitiatory sacrifice in the Mass was first occasioned from dunstical or drowsy apprehensions of the primitive dialect." (Vol. iii., p. 370.)

(m) His saying, "If . . . we should with Romanists admit of a sacrifice by succession or multiplication as everlasting as this transitory world, which shall not last for ever: besides the inconveniences

which they multiply by this vain apology for their wicked practices, we must of necessity acknowledge Melchizedec to have been a type or figure not of Christ, or not of Christ only, or not so properly of Him, as of the whole generation of Mass priests; and his sacrifice to have been a truer type of the unbloody sacrifice which they daily offer, than of Christ's bloody everlasting sacrifice upon the cross." (Vol. viii., p. 243.)

(n) His saying, "Thus you may imagine any Jewish schoolboy . . . would oppose the greatest rabbins of the Romish Church. . . . 'Your priests (as you confess) stand daily ministering and offering the same sacrifice which your High Priest did offer; and therefore, by your apostle's argument against us, and by your own practice, this sacrifice can never take away sin: it is more the same sacrifice than the sacrifices of the law were, and yet it is offered oftener, and in more places, than any legal sacrifices were.'" (Vol. ix., pp. 582, 583.)

(o) His saying, "Now if this argument [in Heb.] be concludent (as no Christian can deny it to be) against the Jews which pleaded for the sufficiency of legal sacrifices, it will conclude *a fortiore*, or with a *πρόσω μᾶλλον* (Heb. ix. 14), against the absolute perfection or sufficiency of our Saviour's sacrifice of Himself (supposing that it should be as the Romanists teach). Thus much it will inevitably infer, according to the peremptory canons of the Roman Church, which plainly teach—and under pain of damnation enjoin all Christians to believe—that Christ's body and blood, that very same body, that very same blood, which were once offered by Himself upon the cross, are daily offered by the Mass priest." (Vol. ix., p. 530.)

Note B, pp. 526, 535.

Because (from the peculiarities of Thorndike's view) there *is* in his language so much of doubtful interpretation (not to say of questionable tendency, because there *is* so much which may quite fairly be cited as seeming (when transported into the region of our present controversy) to afford real and solid support to the Real Objective doctrine; therefore the following quotations are here given, that they may assist in a candid enquiry into the question—whether (however far Thorndike's views may have departed from those of our Reformers, and however near his language may sometimes have approached to that of the Real Objective Presence) his teaching can at all be identified with that with which we have now to do, whether his views will at all support the modern interpretation of Article 29, or whether there be not really a great doctrinal gulph between his own views (as cleared from obscurities of language) and those which really belong to the Real Objective doctrine as now taught.

I.—EXTRACTS BEARING ON THE SENSE OF "SACRAMENTAL," ETC.

(I) "I am persuaded that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist cannot be better expressed than by that term which the Council of

Trent useth, calling it a 'Sacrament,' and saying that the flesh and blood of Christ is 'sacramentally' there; . . . nor do I think the term any less fit or serviceable, *because it serves THEM* to signify the *local*¹ presence of Christ's body and blood under the dimensions of the elements, the substance of them being gone." (Works, Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr., vol. iv., part 1, p. 35.)

(2) "If the Church only pray, that the Spirit of God, coming down on the elements, may make them the body and blood of Christ, *so that they which received them* may be filled with the grace of His Spirit; then is it not the sense of the Catholic Church, that can oblige any man to believe the abolishing of the elements in their bodily substance: because supposing them to remain, they may nevertheless become the instrument of God's Spirit, to convey the operation thereof to them that are disposed to receive it, no otherwise than His flesh and blood conveyed the efficacy thereof upon earth. And that, I suppose, is *reason enough to call it the body and blood of Christ sacramentally*, that is to say, *as in the Sacrament* of the Eucharist." (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 69.)

(3) "The flesh and blood of Christ by incarnation, the elements by consecration, being united to the Spirit, that is the *Godhead* of Christ, become both *one sacramentally*, by being *both one* with the Spirit or *Godhead* of Christ, to the conveying of God's Spirit to a Christian." (Vol. v., p. 173.)

(4) "If this were agreed upon, which *cannot be resisted but by Socinians and Fanatics*; that the body and blood of Christ become present in the Sacrament by the institution of our Lord, by celebrating the sacrament, whereby His institution is executed by consecrating the elements to the purpose that the body and blood of Christ may be received: the whole dispute concerning the manner of the presence in the nature of the formal cause might be superseded. For then *all parties must agree*, that they are *present sacramentally*, as the *nature of a sacrament* requireth." (Vol. v., p. 544.)

II.—EXTRACT BEARING ON RECEPTION BY FAITHLESS.

"Though *no man can receive* the body and blood of Christ that is not disposed *with a living faith* to receive the same, yet *on God's part* it is undoubtedly *tendered* to those that are not so disposed, otherwise how saith the Apostle that those that eat and drink unworthily are guilty of the body and blood of Christ, as not discerning the same?" (Vol. i., part 1, p. 343.)

III.—EXTRACTS BEARING ON THE PRESENCE.

(1) "If any man will think that the forms hitherto described import that the Ancient Church intended to consecrate the elements in the sense of the now Church of Rome, that is, to abolish the corporal

¹ On the sense of "local," see Waterland as quoted above, p. 535. See also p. 541. See also extract below, p. 546, on the local limitations of Christ's body.

substance of them, and substitute that of the body and blood of Christ instead, not in the true sense, to depute them to become visible signs, tendering and exhibiting the invisible grace which they figure, he shall much prejudice the truth which we profess." (Vol. i., part 1, p. 350.)

(2) "When St. Ambrose saith that after consecration the body of the Lord and His blood only is named, and signified, and expressed, this also seems to import a great abatement of the proper signification of the body and blood of Christ." (Vol. i., part 1, p. 351. See also vol. iv., part 1, pp. 27, 28.)

(3) "Certainly, unless we believe the *spiritual* grace of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament of the Eucharist to possess those dimensions which the elements hold (and if so they are not there sacramentally and mystically, but *bodily* and *materially*); we can give no reason why the bodily presence of the elements should hinder it." (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 22.)

(4) "What shall we then say, when the name of Christ's body and blood is attributed to the bread and wine of the Eucharist, but that God would have us understand a supernatural conjunction and union between the body and blood of Christ and the said bread and wine, whereby they become as truly the instrument of conveying God's Spirit to them who receive as they ought, as the same Spirit was always in His natural body and blood?" (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 25.)

(5) "If, by virtue of the hypostatical union, the omnipresence of the Godhead is communicated to the flesh and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, then is the flesh and blood of Christ there, not only mystically, but *bodily*." (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 26.)¹

(6) "Is it any way pertinent to the spiritual eating of them [Christ's flesh and blood] that they are *bodily* present? Is it not far more proper to that which the Lord was about (tending, without question, to the *spiritual* union which He seeks with His Church); that He should be understood to promise the mystical, than the *bodily*, presence of them in the Sacrament, which is nothing else than a mystery in the proper signification and intent of it?" (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 27.)

(7) "How is it requisite, that they [Christ's flesh and blood] be there in *bodily* substance, as if the mystical presence of them were not a sufficient means to convey His Spirit, which we see is conveyed by the mere spiritual consideration and resolution of a lively and effectual faith?" (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 32.)

(8) "Having proved the consecration of the Eucharist to be the production of the body and blood of Christ crucified, or the causing of them to be mystically present in the elements thereof, as in a sacrament representing them separated by the crucifying of Christ." (Vol. iv., part 1, pp. 116, 117.) [It is right to observe that "representing" here signifies "tendering to a man's possession." See vol. iv., part 1, p. 20.]

¹ It is important to read extracts (3) and (5) in connexion.

IV.—EXTRACT BEARING ON THE PRESENCE, IN RELATION TO THE HUMAN NATURE OF CHRIST.

“If in the proper dimensions thereof [*i.e.*, of Christ’s body] He ‘parted from’ His disciples, and ‘went,’ was ‘carried,’ or lifted and ‘taken up into heaven;’ . . . if ‘the heavens must receive Him till’ that time; . . . if to that purpose He ‘leave the world’ . . . ‘no more’ to be ‘in’ it . . . so that we shall have Him no more with us, . . . it behoveth us to understand how we are informed, *that the promise of His body and blood in the Eucharist imports an EXCEPTION to so many declarations, before we believe it.* Indeed, there is no place of God’s right hand, by sitting down at which we may say that our Lord’s body becomes confined to the same place;¹ but seeing the flesh of Christ is taken up into heaven to sit down at God’s right hand (though, by His sitting down at God’s right hand we understand the man Christ to be put into the exercise of that Divine power and command which His Mediator’s office requires), yet His *body we must understand to be confined to that place*, where the majesty of God appears to those that attend upon His throne. Neither shall the appearing of Christ to St. Paul (Acts xxiii. 11) be any exception to this appointment.² He that would insist, indeed, that the body of Christ stood over Paul in the castle where then he lodged, *must say that it left heaven for that purpose.*” (Vol. iv., part 1, pp. 47, 48.)

V.—EXTRACTS BEARING ON THE PRESENCE, IN RELATION TO LUTHERAN DOCTRINE.

(1) “Referring to judgment, whether the evidence for consubstantiation or transubstantiation be such as for the Holy Trinity out of the Scriptures; that is to say, whether the presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in the Eucharist is so to be understood, as to void the confining of them to those dimensions, which the Scripture allows them in heaven (and this as necessarily, by the Scripture, as the Scripture necessarily obligeth to believe the Holy Trinity); when as it may be, more properly to the nature of the business, understood mystically, as in a Sacrament, intended to convey the communion of His Spirit.” (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 50.)

(2) “Securing first that which the common salvation requireth in the Sacrament, to wit, the *receiving* of the flesh and blood of Christ *by it*, by imputing the presence of them to the consecration, not to the faith of him that receives; it [the doctrine of St. Gregory Nyssen] condemns the error of transubstantiation, making the change mystical and immediate upon the coming of God’s Spirit to the elements, the nature of them remaining; but it condemns consubstantiation

¹ “The common argument of the Lutherans and Ubiquitarians.” (Thorndike’s note.)

² “It is instanced as such an exception by Chemnitius, *De Duab. Naturis*, c. xxx., p. 188. Compare also Bellarm., *De Sacr. Euch.*, lib. iii., c. 3; *Controv.*, tom. ii., p. 672.” (Thorndike’s note.)

for no less; for what needs the flesh and blood of Christ fill the same dimensions, which the substance of the elements possesseth, being both united with His Spirit? And truly they, that invite the Lutherans to their communion, professing consubstantiation, must not make transubstantiation an error in the foundation of the faith." (Vol. v., pp. 173, 174.)

(3) "The petitioner no way doubts, that the manner of the presence is to be cleared, neither by transubstantiation, nor by consubstantiation, nor by those that derive it not from the consecration." (Vol. v., pp. 324, 325.)

VI.—EXTRACTS BEARING ON THE PRESENCE, IN RELATION TO USE.

(1) "Nor would it have been a custom, in some places to burn the remains of the Sacrament; or at Constantinople to give them to school-boys: had they not conceived the change of the elements to be in order to the use of them, and that this use, and that which is done in order thereunto expireth, when the occasion of giving them to those for whom the Church intended them ceaseth." (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 81.)

(2) "The liturgies themselves . . . do limit the being and presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements to the benefit of them that shall communicate." (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 126; see also part 2, p. 738.)

VII.—EXTRACTS BEARING ON SACRIFICIAL DOCTRINE.

(1) "If the consecrated elements be the flesh and blood of Christ, then are they the sacrifice of Christ crucified upon the cross. For they are not the flesh and blood of Christ as in His body, while it was whole; but as separated by the passion of His cross. Not that Christ can be sacrificed again. For a sacrifice, being an action done in succession of time, cannot be done the second time, being once done; because then it would not have been done before. But because the sacrifice of Christ crucified is represented, commemorated, and applied, by celebrating and receiving the Sacrament, which is that sacrifice. They of the Church of Rome, that would make the breach wider than it is, do but justify the Reformation, by forcing any other reason of a sacrifice and of the Scripture, expounded by the consent of God's Church." (Vol. v., pp. 174, 175.)

(2) "It is true, the properties and effects of things signified are in some sense truly attributed to the signs. But he that enlarges his language beyond that sense, may give, and he that understands the limitations requisite, may take offence, when there is no need. Otherwise, the reasons of these limitations are evident enough to save any sober or charitable men 'either from inflaming or taking up offences.' For common sense, which tells all men that what is once done can never be done again, obliges them to understand an *abatement* in the property of that language which attributes the sacri-

ficing of Christ to a priest; because, once done upon the cross, it can never be done again." (Vol. iv., part 1, pp. 122, 123.)

(3) "The Council of Trent enjoineeth to believe, that Christ 'instituted a new passover,' to be 'sacrificed,' as well as represented, commemorated, and offered, in the Eucharist . . . which is false. For the sacrifice of Christ's cross is commemorated, represented, and offered as ready to be slain, in and by the Eucharist; but not slain, and therefore not sacrificed, in it and in celebrating it." (Vol. v., p. 615.)

VIII.—EXTRACT BEARING ON ADORATION.

"Though the Sacrament of the Eucharist may be the occasion to determine the circumstance of the worshipping of Christ, yet is it itself no way capable of any worship that may be counted religious, because religion enjoineeth it. Cardinal Bellarmine . . . would have it said, that the sign is worshipped materially, but the body and blood of Christ formally, in the Eucharist; which are terms that signify nothing. . . . Therefore the sign in the Eucharist seems only to determine, why that worship which is always everywhere due, is here now tendered." (Vol. iv., part 2, p. 757.)

The reader may like to have before him the following words of Archbishop Wake concerning Thorndike: "But yet after all, I will not deny but that this learned person seems to have had a particular notion in this matter, and which is far enough from what our author would fix upon him. He thought that the Elements by consecration were united to the Godhead of Christ, much after the same manner as His natural body was by incarnation, and that so the very elements became after a sort His body." (Wake in Gibson's *Preservative*, Edit. 1848. Vol. x., p. 75.)

Note C, p. 532.

The following extract from the Judgment may be thought to demand some special attention:—

"At the Savoy Conference in 1661, the Presbyterians desired the restoration of the declaration [*i.e.*, the Black Rubric], and the Bishops opposed it, but eventually consented to its restoration, with an alteration of the most material character—namely, the substitution of the words 'Corporal Presence of Christ's *natural* flesh and blood,' for the words 'real and essential presence there being,' etc." [*i.e.*, "there being of Christ's *natural* flesh and blood." Black Rubric of 1552.] (Judgment, p. 95; Rivingtons.)

The following questions, suggested by this passage, are submitted for careful investigation.

1. Were the Savoy Episcopal Commissioners, as such, the revisers of our Liturgy? (Ibid., pp. 374, 375.)
2. Can the *animus* of the Episcopal Commissioners be safely and certainly regarded as the *animus* which ruled the Revision?

3. Can the answers of the Episcopal Commissioners be relied upon as interpretative of the Revision and the changes effected?

Supposing an affirmative answer *could* be given to the above questions, the words of the Bishops in reply to the Presbyterians would deserve careful attention. They are as follows:—"This rub. is not in the Liturgy of Queen Elizabeth, nor confirmed by law; nor is there *any* GREAT NEED of *restoring it*, the world being now in more *danger of profanation than of idolatry*. Besides the *sense* of it is *declared sufficiently* in the 28th Article of the Church of England." (Cardwell's Conferences, p. 354.)

And then the following questions would naturally be suggested:—

1. Did the Episcopal Commissioners object at all to the restoration of the Black Rubric, *as it stood*, on doctrinal grounds? (Ibid., pp. 385, 386, sqq.)

2. Does not their answer imply that—looking upon the Rubric unchanged—they had no *objection* to make to its doctrine?

3. Does it not even amount to a declaration that they *could desire* no change in its *sense*, and therefore no change in its *doctrine*?

4. Does it not also amount to a declaration that in their view, the adoration of "any real and essential presence there of Christ's natural flesh and blood" *would have been "idolatry"*?

5. Does it not also amount to a declaration that they understood the 28th Article to exclude "any real and essential presence there being," as well as any "Corporal Presence" of "Christ's natural flesh and blood"?

The following further questions, therefore, must now be asked:—

1. Should we not have been led to the conclusion (even if the Revision had been *ruled* by the Episcopal Commissioners) that the change must be interpreted as indicating a preference for a form of expression—with no change of sense or doctrine?

2. Must we not much rather be led to this conclusion, if we have evidence that the Revision was ruled by an *animus* which (to say the least) declined to adopt the most important suggestions bearing anything like the impress of Laudian Theology? (Ibid., pp. 373-376, 345, 317, 318; and Walton's Rubrical Determination, pp. 25, 26, 35, 36.)

3. Does not this conclusion receive some confirmation from the fact that in the same Rubric several other changes were made in forms of expression?

4. Is not this conclusion further confirmed by the way in which the Revision has dealt with other parts of the Service?

5. Is it not inconceivable that, if the change had been designed to indicate such a change of doctrine as should admit the Real Objective Presence, the Revision should (1) have left the Consecration Prayer unchanged, (2) rejecting the proposals of Sancroft, etc., should have "ordered all in the old method" (ibid., p. 374; see also pp. 375, 376, also pp. 345, 366, 370, 299-301), and (3) in this same Rubric, should have allowed the order for kneeling to stand accounted for as "well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknow-

ledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue"?

Yet further it may be asked—

(1) Is there not evidence that the Black Rubric *was* regarded—after the change—by English Divines as a distinct and unquestionable denial of any such adoration as is held to be due to the Real Objective Presence? (Ibid., pp. 386, 387, 389, 390; see also pp. 309, 310, and 385-389, and Archbishop Wake, as quoted in Garbett's *Voices of the Church of England*, p. 139.)

(2) Is there any evidence that the change in the Black Rubric was regarded, by any English Divines, as making room for any such adoration? ¹

There *is* some evidence, indeed (though it is somewhat hard of belief), that one person ("D. P. G.," probably Doctor Peter Gunning) did imagine that the change admitted of such a presence as "that by the virtue of the words of consecration, there was a *cylinder* of a *vacuum* made between the elements and Christ's body in heaven; so that no body being between, it was both in heaven and in the elements." (See Burnet's *History of Reformation*, Part iii., Preface, vol. i., p. 599, Edit. Orr, 1850; see also Perry on Declaration, pp. 70, 71.) But it is believed that very few people will think of attributing to the Revisers what Bishop Burnet calls "such a solemn piece of folly as this." And though Gunning may have been in some sense "the author" of the change, it must be interpreted not by "such a solemn piece of folly" as Burnet attributes to him, but by the sense in which it was adopted in the Revision. It must be added that, even supposing the change to have made room for Gunning's very extraordinary conception of *presence*, it would not follow that it made room for "any such adoration" as is held to be due to the "Real Objective Presence." For whatever may be thought of the *verbal* change in the statement of the *presence* denied, there was no change at all made (to which any significance can be attached) in the declaration of the *adoration* denied.

And it may well be questioned whether even Gunning would have regarded *such a presence* (perhaps some might prefer to call it *absence*) in the elements, as an object of adoration.

It will be observed that Burnet himself supplies evidence that the Rubric *as changed* was regarded in high quarters *at the time* as "an express declaration made against the *Real Presence*;" and that (when an explanation was required) no attempt was made by high ecclesiastical authority to suggest that any other interpretation might be given to it. (Ibid., p. 306.)

It may be added that in the MS. volume of the "History of his Own Time" (Harleian MSS., No. 6584), Burnet has written:—"There

¹ Kennett writes as if quite unconscious of the Rubric's having undergone any change to which any doctrinal significance could be attributed. (Ibid. pp. 385, 393; and Perry on Declaration concerning Kneeling, p. 309.) The same may be said of Collier (see *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. v., p. 436), though not of Burnet.

were some small alterations made in the Book of Common Prayer, together with some additions, the most important was that concerning the kneeling in the Sacrament, which had been put in the Second Book of Common Prayer set out by Edward the 6th, but was left out by Queen Elizabeth, and was now by Bishop Gawden's means put in at the end of the Office of the Communion. Sheldon opposed it, but Gawden was seconded by Southampton and Morley. The Duke complained of this much to me, as a puritanical thing, and spake severely of Gawden, as a popular man, for his procuring it to be added (though I have been told that it was used in King James's time)." (See Perry on Declaration, p. 302.)

It appears that Gauden had taken "the solemn league and covenant," though he had published "certain doubts and scruples of conscience" about it (see Baxter and Biog. Britannica, as quoted in Perry on Declaration, p. 302), and had also been chosen one of the Westminster Assembly, though afterwards his name was "struck off the list, and Mr. Thomas Goodwin put into his room." (See Baxter and Biog. Britannica, as quoted in Perry on Declaration, p. 303.) Baxter says of him, "Bishop Gawden was our most constant helper." (*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, London, 1696, p. 363. See also pp. 217, 218. See also Perry on Declaration, p. 322.)

It is also worthy of special observation, that the change of expression in the Rubric was but a return to the original language of the Latin Article (28) of 1553 ["*carnis ejus et sanguinis Realem et Corporalem (ut loquuntur) præsentiam.*"] So that (as Dr. Blakeney observes—on Common Prayer, 3rd Edit., p. 434) "the Revisers of 1661 in the word *corporal*, selected the very term which was chosen by our Reformers to express their meaning in the article from which the declaration is taken." (*Ibid.*, p. 382.)

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND BOOKS

QUOTED AND REFERRED TO.

- Abbot, on the True Church, referred to, 522.
 Abridgment of Apology of Lincolnshire Ministers, 244.
 Ab Ulmis, John, Letters to Bullinger, as to Religion in England, 103, 104.
 Addison, Dean, quoted, 232.
 Advice, The Humble, of the Westminster Assembly, 211.
 Ælfric, referred to, 77.
 quoted, 437, 438.
 A Lasco, his influence with Cranmer, 26, 524.
 quoted, 257, 258, 398, 503, 529.
 Albertinus, 240, 454.
 Aldrich, quoted, 168, 265, 392, 529, 531.
 referred to, 396.
 Allen, Robert, 213.
 Alley, Bishop, Poor Man's Library, quoted, 297, 364, 464.
 Altar of Damascus, 244.
 Ambrose, St., quoted, 61, 81, 84, 85, 275, 276, 327, 354, 545.
 Andrewes, Bishop, quoted, 86, 393.
 as to episcopacy, 195.
 as to relation to Christ's death, 272.
 referred to, 351.
 Antidotum Lincolnense, see Heylyn.
 Apology of the Church of England, account of, 126, 127.
 quoted, as to limits of Christ's Body, 127.
 as to Sacraments, 127.
 as to reception by faith, 128.
 on *touching* the Body of Christ, 128.
 as to adoration, 128.
 as to application by faith, not by the act of the Priest, 129.
 as to reception by wicked, 129, 419.
 as to Christ being Himself the Giver of the *res Sacramenti*, 245.
 Articles, Ten, of 1536, 476.
 Articles of 1538, 476.
 Articles, Irish (1615), quoted for language like that of our Catechism, 209.
 Articuli Visitatorii Saxonie, 485.
 Assembly, see Westminster.
 Augsburg Ministers, 262.
 Augustine (of Canterbury), 77.
 Augustine, St., referred to, 78, 99, 452, 453, 454 sqq.
 quoted, 16, 31, 48, 61, 62, 80, 81, 82, 84, 135, 136, 156, 157, 246, 268,
 269, 353, 380, 422, 423, 453, 454, 494, 512 sqq.

- Babington, Bishop, quoted, 364.
 Bancroft, Archbishop, "Dangerous Positions," referred to, 286.
 Bardsley, Rev. J., quoted, 297 sqq.
 Barlow, Dr., quoted as to relation to Christ's Death, 272, 273.
 Barrow, Dr. I., quoted as to Christ's Human Nature, 89.
 as to sense of word "Mysteries," 348.
 as to unworthy reception, 411.
 Baxter, referred to, 345.
 his Prayer Book quoted, 211, 286, 314, 324.
 Baxter's Narrative, referred to, 314.
 Bayly, Bishop, quoted, 245, 488, 490, 491, 528.
 referred to, 350.
 "Beaten Oil for the Sanctuary," quoted, 336.
 Becon, account of, 64.
 quoted as to the words "till He come," 28.
 as to altars, 36.
 as to reception by wicked, 65, 66, 67.
 as to corporal reception, 65.
 as to faith, the soul's mouth, 65, 249, 521.
 as to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 65.
 as to table instead of altar, 66, 68.
 as to adoration, 68.
 as to figurative interpretation of the words of Institution, 521.
 as to the Elements being not bare signs, 178.
 as to the *res Sacramenti* being received from God, 246.
 as to real reception without the outward sign, 271.
 as to teaching of St. Augustine, 515, 516.
 Bedell, Bishop, quoted, 508, 536.
 Beleth, quoted, 427.
 Bellarmine, quoted, 6, 88, 364, 372, 411, 431, 477.
 referred to, 167, 427, 546.
 Bennet's Essay on 39 Articles, referred to, 441.
 quoted, 448.
 Bennett, Rev. W. J., "Plea for Toleration," quoted, 4.
 Berengarius, referred to, 521, 522.
 Bernard, St., quoted, 168.
 Bertram or Ratramn, the influence of his work on Ridley, 26, 522.
 quoted, 183, 267, 271, 275, 276, 349.
 on Real Objective Presence, 520.
 his alleged Calvinism, 521.
 Beveridge, quoted, 99, 411.
 Beza, referred to as to sense of the word "Sacrifice," 539.
 quoted, 76, 193, 463.
 as to Sacramental analogy, 217, 250, 251.
 as to Sacramental conjunction, 217.
 as to efficacy of Christ's flesh, 222.
 as to Sacramental conveyance, 227.
 as to reception of "*res Sacramenti*," 251, 252.
 as to sense of "with" and "under," 251.
 as justifying the word "taken," 255.
 as to heavenly and spiritual manner, 255.
 as to real offer, 319.
 as to sense of mystery, 348, 349, 350.

- Beza, quoted as to adoration, 398.
as to unworthy reception, 442.
as to Sacramental efficacy, 466.
as to reception by wicked, 477.
- Bilson, account of, 68.
quoted as to reception by wicked, 68, 69.
as to manducation by the soul, by faith only, 69.
as to ascending to heaven to eat, 69, 70.
as to manducation spiritual, 69, 70.
as to dynamical presence, 70, 71.
as to Real Presence, 70, 71, 197.
as to adoration, 71, 379.
as to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 71, 359, 360, 361, 368.
as to phrase "under the forms," 160, 161.
as to speech and sense of Fathers, 369.
referred to, 324, 350.
- Bingham, quoted as to breaking of the bread, 324.
as to adoration, 333, 380.
as to oblations, 345.
as to sense of "mystery," 349.
as to sacrifice, 352, 353.
- Bisse, "Beauty of Holiness," quoted, 336.
- Blakeney, Dr., quoted, 9, 121, 286, 306, 308, 349, 353, 356, 365, 366, 374, 375, 400.
referred to, 26, 103, 167, 188, 315, 345, 357.
- Blunt, J. H., referred to, 103, 197, 286, 294, 306, 323, 343, 397.
- Blunt, Professor J. J., quoted, 354.
- Bonar, quoted, 490.
- Bonaventura, quoted, 134.
- Bonner, referred to, 145.
- Bossuet (Bishop of Condom, 1669, and of Meaux, 1681), referred to, 207, 334, 353, 502.
- Bradford, account of, 47, 48.
referred to, 101, 102, 420.
quoted as to the words, "Till He come," 28.
as to reception by wicked, 48, 49, 50, 51, 473.
as to Presence to faith, 48, 49, 50, 51.
as to Presence under the form of bread and wine, 49.
as to inclusion, 49.
as to Real Presence, 50, 51.
as to distinction between Christ's body and the grace, 51.
as to Presence on the Altar, 51.
as to Sacrifice of Mass, 52.
as to elements being not bare signs, 174, 175.
as to relation to Christ's death, 272.
as to phrase, "Corporal Presence," 392.
as to phrase, "give grace," 462.
as to synonymous use of "Eat" and "Receive," 470.
as to teaching of St. Augustine, 514.
- Bradshaw, English Puritanism, 244.
- Bramhall, Archbishop, quoted, 360.
as to adoration, 379, 380.
as to episcopacy, 195.

- Brett, Dr., quoted, 300, 301, 366, 400, 401.
 Brevint, Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass, quoted as to "full and literal" sense of words of Institution, 192.
 as to Sacramental Conveyance, 267.
 as to adoration, 380, 381, 532.
 Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, quoted as to sacramental conveyance, 227.
 as to relation to Christ's Death, 274.
 as to Organical Presence, 280, 281.
 Bridges, Dean, quoted, 22.
 Brooks, quoted, 214.
 Browne, Bishop, On Articles, quoted, 145, 303, 329.
 Bucer, referred to, 102, 103.
 quoted as to giving and receiving, 254, 264, 265.
 as to heavenly and spiritual manner, 255.
 as to first Book of Edward VI., 294, 342.
 as to Prayer of Humble Access, 327.
 as to Consecration Prayer, 371.
 as to distinction between *receiving* and *eating*, 469, 470.
 as to points of controversy between Luther and the Reformed, 478.
 as to "giving," 489.
 as to "eating," 492.
 as to "giving and receiving," 500.
 as to "oral reception," etc., 507, 508.
 Buckeridge, Bishop, quoted, 366.
 Bull, Bishop, quoted as to Sacrifice, 360, 369.
 Bulley, Variations, referred to, 167, 297, 306, 317, 323, 324, 326, 328, 333, 345, 374, 393, 532.
 Bullinger, account of, 129-131.
 Decades, account of, 131, 132.
 quoted, 2, 28, 61, 62, 101, 102.
 as to Sacramental Union, 132, 133.
 as to reception by wicked, 137.
 as to limits of Christ's Body, 135, 136.
 as to relation of grace to Sacraments, 133.
 as to sense of words, "This is My Body," 135.
 as to presence "unspeakably," "not as in a place," 135.
 as to words, "until He come," 136.
 as to ubiquity, 136.
 as to vestments, 426, 427.
 as to Real Presence, 136, 523.
 as to spiritual eating, 137.
 as to Sacramental eating, 539, 540.
 as to reception by unbelievers, 137.
 referred to as to Priest and Sacrifice, 138.
 as to elements being not bare signs, 179.
 as to effectual signs, 409.
 as to sense of "spiritually," 487.
 as to "giving," 489.
 as to reception of "Res Sacramenti," 490.
 as to "eating," 492.
 De Sacramentis, Cranmer on, 524.

- Burcher, Letter to Bullinger referred to, 102.
Burgess, Dr., referred to, 199, 200.
 quoted, 388.
Burgess, "Reformed Church of England," 348.
Burnett, referred to, 116, 306, 450; quoted, 382, 383, 387, 388, 550.

Calfhill, account of, 71.
 as to Mass and Sacrifice, 72.
Calovius, Exegema Aæ. Confess., 477.
Calvin, quoted, 20, 158, 165, 179, 216, 218, 222, 225, 245, 247, 408, 454, 463,
 484, 490, 491, 495, 499, 503.
 as to manducation, 256.
 as to word *substance*, 261, 262, 263.
 as to real offer, 320.
 as to adoration, 398.
 as to sacramental efficacy, 467.
 as to "giving," 489.
 referred to, 237.
Campion, the Jesuit, quoted, 422, 470.
Canon 57, quoted, 303, 304.
Canons of 1640, quoted, 351.
Cardwell, Doc. Annals, quoted, 35, 199.
 Reformatio Legum, referred to, 112, 113.
 Synodalia, referred to, 116.
 quoted, 149, 351, 393.
Conferences, referred to, 187, 188, 189, 198, 200, 231, 294, 306, 314, 323,
 327, 345, 375, 395, 450, 549.
Liturgies of Edward VI., Preface quoted as to the influence of foreigners,
 328, 524.
 as to first Liturgy, 334.
 referred to, 342.
Carter, Rev. T. T., quoted, 401.
Cartwright, T., quoted, 16, 17.
Cary, Testimonies of Fathers, quoted, 454.
Case of Kneeling, quoted, 386.
Cassander, referred to, 361, 370, 372.
Catalini, quoted, 333.
Catechism of Edward VI., account of, 115, 116.
 quoted as to Christ's absence in Body, 117.
 absent from mouth, but present to faith, 117.
 as to reception by the working of the Spirit, 118.
 as to faith the soul's mouth, 118, 249.
Catechism of Cranmer, quoted, 184, 185.
 referred to, 336.
Catechism of Nowell, account of, 119-122.
 quoted as to limits and absence of Christ's Body, 122, 123, 125, 126.
 as to the sealing efficacy of Sacraments, 122.
 as to reception by faith only, 123.
 as to comparison with Baptism, 124.
 as to faith the soul's mouth, 124, 248, 249.
 as to secret and marvellous communication, 125.
 as to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 125.
 as to relation to Christ's death, 125.

- Catechism of Nowell, quoted as to reception by faithful only, 125, 126.
as to sense of *faithful*, 232.
as to *res sacramenti* being given by the Holy Ghost, 248.
as to relation to Christ's *Death*, 272.
- Catechism, Nowell's Smaller, quoted, 196, 197, 255, 488, 501, 502.
- Catechism, The Church, its elementary character, 186-190.
addition to, desired at Hampton Court Conference, 197.
at Savoy Conference, 187.
part added at Hampton Court Conference, 188.
its authority, at first, only that of the King's Proclamation, 188.
drawn up by Bishop Overall, 190.
compiled from Nowell's smallest Catechism, 196, 197.
its teaching supported by language of our Reformers, 205, 206.
of foreign Confessions, 206-210.
of English Puritans, 210-213.
- Catechism, an old English (Froschover), quoted, 491.
- Catechism, Heidelberg, quoted, 260, 261.
- Catechism of Calvin, quoted, 263, 264.
- Cautions for the times, quoted, 400, 502.
- Cazenove, "Aspects of the Reformation," quoted, 111.
- Chamier, *Panstratia Catholica*, referred to, 324, 349, 463.
quoted, 467, 483.
- Charnock, quoted for language like that of Catechism, 212.
- Cheke, Sir John, quoted, 33.
- Chemnitius, 546.
- Christian Observer, referred to, 466.
- Christian Remembrancer, referred to, 307.
- Chrysostom, quoted, 30, 31, 84.
- Church and the World, 310, 332, 341, 343, 345, 347, 399.
- Church and the Age, 337, 346, 358, 364.
- Churton, Archdeacon, quoted, 168.
- "Coal from Altar," 316.
- Cobb, Rev. G. F., "Kiss of Peace," referred to, 5, 187, 255, 323.
quoted, 6, 10, 189, 217, 231, 254, 284, 417.
- Colet, Dean, his Catechism, quoted, 197.
- Collier, Eccles. History, quoted, 33, 159, 197, 198, 199, 200, 431.
referred to, 116, 306, 330, 341, 343, 351.
- Colloquy of Poissy (1561), quoted, 210.
- Comber, Dean, quoted, 410, 528.
- Comparison between Liturgy and Mass-book, 244.
- Concordia Witebergensis, 481, 536.
- Confessions of Faith, 106.
2nd Helvetic, quoted for language like that of our Catechism, 207.
as to Sacramental efficacy, 467.
as to giving, 498.
quoted, 487, 518.
- 1st Helvetic, quoted for same purpose, 207, 208.
referred to, 467, 483.
- of Basle, quoted for same purpose, 208.
- of France, quoted for same purpose, 208.
- of Scotland, quoted for same purpose, 208, 209.
- of Belgia, quoted for same purpose, 209.
quoted, 517, 518.

- Confessions of Augsburg, quoted, 234.
Tetrapolitan, quoted, 495, 497.
Westminster, quoted as to breaking of bread, 324.
as to phrases "Real Presence," "Corporal Presence," 395, 537.
- Consensus Orthodoxus, quoted, 179, 455, 485.
as to real reception of the "Res Sacramenti," 218.
as to exhibition by Holy Spirit, 248.
as to "Datur et accipitur," 254.
as to manducation, 256.
as to phrases, "Real Presence," "Corporal Presence," 395, 537.
as to reception by unworthy, 441, 442.
as to phrase, "Confer grace," 465, 466.
referred to, 521.
- Consensus Tigurinus, quoted, 264.
- Contarini, G., quoted, 349, 362.
- Cooke, Sir Anthony, see *Diallacticon*, 43.
- Cooke, Letter to Perry, referred to, 346.
- Cooper, account of, 72.
quoted as to meaning of "This is my Body," 73.
as to sacrifice, 73.
- Cosin, Bishop, referred to, 6, 209, 317, 332, 337, 528.
quoted, 168, 198, 268, 326, 327, 371.
as to Mass, 351, 361, 362.
as to oblation, 353, 361, 368, 369.
as to adoration, 385.
as to elevation, 385.
his change of views, 191.
as to eating of Christ's flesh as *Crucified*, 229.
as to consent of Protestants in Real Presence, 237.
as to kneeling at Communion time, 389.
as to reception of the Body and Blood, 528.
- Couper, see Cooper.
- Courayer, quoted, 353, 354, 357.
referred to, 378.
- Coverdale, account of, 73, 74.
quoted as to manducation by faith, 74.
as to Mass and Sacrifice, 74.
as to adoration, 74.
as to expression "under the forms," 159.
translation of Calvin quoted, 245.
as to real reception without the outward sign, 270.
- Cox, J. E., referred to, 106, 437, 463.
Protestantism and Romanism, referred to, 521.
- Crackanthorp, *Defensio Eccles. Angl.*, quoted, 309, 310.
as to Rainolds, 199.
as to adoration, 309, 310.
referred to, 380.
- Cranmer, account of, 7.
quoted as to Corporal Presence, 7, 8, 9, 237.
as to "true eating and drinking," 8.
as to Spiritual Presence, 8.
as to reception by wicked, 473.
as to offering Christ, 9.

- Cranmer, quoted as to oral manducation, 9.
as to gross carnal eating, 9.
as to "Real Presence," 11.
as to *not real* sense of *Sacramental*, 61.
as to guilt of unworthy receivers, 101.
as to "being under the form of bread and wine," 147, 185, 525.
as to elements being not bare signs, 173.
as to giving of the *res sacramenti*, 205.
as to spiritual eyes, hands, mouth, 216.
as to substantial Presence, 218.
as to digesting Christ's Death, 226.
as to digesting Christ's Flesh *absent*, 226.
as to Christ Himself the giver of the *res sacramenti*, 244, 245.
as to faith being as hand and mouth, 248.
as to real reception without the outward sign, 269.
as to relation to Christ's Death, 271.
as to eating "that selfsame body," 277, 278.
as to Presence in elements, 319, 524.
as to his independence of foreign aid, 331.
as to 1st book of Edward, 335, 344.
as to adoration, 389.
as to phrase, "Real Presence," 391.
as to unworthy reception, 101, 473.
as to distinction between *real* and *effectual* receiving, 413, 414.
as to synonymous use of "*eat*" and "*receive*," 470.
as to sense of spiritually, 487.
as to "receiving," 493.
as to "giving," 495.
as to "Institution," 502.
as to mode of reception only in question, 503.
as to teaching of St. Augustine, 512, 513.
influenced by Ridley, 26.
by A Lasco, 26, 524.
sent First Book of Homilies to Gardiner, 145.
quoted also, 287, 290, 309, 402, 403.
referred to, 94, 116.
see Catechism.
- Cudworth, Discourse concerning Lord's Supper, referred to, 351.
- Cyprian, quoted, 158.
referred to, 354.
- Cyril, quoted, 78, 79.
- Cyril, Lucar, 466.
- Daniel, Dr., Codex Liturgicus, quoted, 365, 437.
- D'Aubigné, quoted, 394.
- Davenant, Bishop, quoted, 492, 527.
referred to, 508, 536, 537.
- Davenport, Letter to Sandcroft, concerning Overall and Mason, 195.
- Debate concerning the English Liturgy, 243.
- Declaratio Thoruniensis, quoted, 326, 394, 405, 406.
- Declaration of twenty-one Priests, 351, 352.
- Defence of a certain poor man, quoted, 158.

- Denison, quoted, 2, 406.
referred to, 3, 4, 5, 286.
- Diallacticon, the authorship, 43, 537.
quoted, as to dynamical presence, 43, 44, 536.
illustrated by Sun, 44.
as to Limits of Christ's Body, 44.
as to symbolical Body, 44.
- Directions, propounded and humbly presented to Parliament, 242.
- Directorium Anglicanum, 298.
- Directory, see Westminster.
- Doctrine of the Eucharist stated, quoted, 377, 378.
- Dodwell, Discourses concerning the One Altar, 531, 536.
- Dorman, 435.
- Downes's Appendix to Sparrow's Rationale, quoted, 329, 330, 375.
referred to, 330.
- Dryander, referred to, 145.
- Dublin, see Review.
- Dugdale, Life of Geste, 306, 371, 506.
- Du Pin, quoted, 358.
referred to, 365.
- Durandus, quoted, 271, 372.
- Edgar's Variations of Popery, referred to, 208, 210, 521.
- Edward, King, see Catechism.
Letter to Ridley, quoted, 35, 297.
- Elizabeth, Queen, Injunctions, 35.
- Elliott, Rev. E. B., quoted as to Sarum and York Manuals, 268.
- Emissenus, quoted, 182, 249.
- Enchiridion, Christ, instit. of Hermann, quoted, 354.
- Essays on the Church, referred to, 206.
- Estcourt, Dogmatic teaching of the Common Prayer, referred to, 103.
quoted, 302, 303, 304, 325.
- Examination—Short, Sober, Pacific, of Common Prayer, 242.
- Exceptions, LIX., against Book of Common Prayer, 242, 243.
- Exercise, see Morning.
- Faber, Difficulties of Romanism, referred to, 365.
- Fagius, P., referred to, 102, 342.
- Felix, Minucius, quoted, 380.
- Field, Bishop, Parasceve Paschæ, quoted, as to real offer, 320.
as to teaching of Catechism, 321.
as to Prayer of Humble Access, 327.
referred to, 345, 527, 529, 538.
- Field, Dean, quoted, 172.
- Fisher, Ambrose, "Defence of Liturgy," referred to, 200.
quoted, as to meaning of Catechism, 232.
as to adoration, 388.
as to phrase, "confer grace," 465.
- Flavel, quoted, for language like that of our Catechism, 211.
- Forbes, Bishop (Edinburgh), "Considerationes Modestæ," referred to, 463, 535.
- Forbes, Bishop (Brechin), on Articles, quoted, 255, 257, 417.
referred to, 3, 253, 254, 284, 364, 383, 454.

- Formula Concordiæ, quoted, 449, 450, 481, 482, 485, 486, 493.
 Fortescue, Letter to Archdeacon Freeman, referred to, 315.
 Foxe, John, quoted, 35, 391, 529.
 Acts and Monuments, account of, 149.
 quoted, 152.
 referred to, 424.
 Frankfort, Ministers of, quoted, 263.
 Freeman, Archdeacon, quoted, 303, 381, 382.
 referred to, 310.
 Frith, quoted, 529.
 Fulgentius, referred to, 99, 456.
 Fulke, account of, 74, 75.
 as to words "Sacerdos," "Priest," etc., 75.
 as to Mass and Sacrifice, 75, 76.
 as to sacramental signs and pledges (Beza), 76.
 as to Corporal and Spiritual Presence, 76.
 as to Sacrifice, 76, 77.
 as to Carnal Presence, 77.
 as to adoration, 77.
 as to reception by wicked, 77, 422.
 as to praying towards the East, 316.
 as to sense of St. Augustine, 423.
 as to "effectual signs," 464.
 as to synonymous use of "eat" and "receive," 470.
 Fuller, Church History, quoted, 199.
 referred to, 209.
 Garbett, Voices of the Church of England, referred to, 3, 395.
 quoted, as to teaching of Laudian School, 238-240.
 Garbett, Lecture on the Lord's Supper, quoted, 50, 350, 351.
 Gardiner's Examination of Roman Catholic Faith, referred to, 454, 539.
 Gardiner, Bishop, quoted, 6, 147, 308, 309, 412, 413, 444, 470, 522.
 Gauden, Bp., and the Puritans, 551.
 Gauden, Eccles. Angl. Suspiria, referred to, 338, 522, 537.
 Gerdes, Scrinium Antiquarium, quoted, 497, 498.
 Gerhard, Confessio Catholica, quoted, 353, 354.
 as to adoration, 382.
 Geste, Bishop, referred to, 306, 531.
 quoted, 471, 506, 507.
 as to Consecration Prayer, 371.
 as to the word "only" in Article 28, 446.
 as to Article 29, 446.
 Goade, in Conference with Campion, 412, 422, 423.
 Goode, Dean, referred to, 6, 62, 145, 170, 172, 190, 204, 301, 313, 345, 365,
 454, 531.
 quoted, 126, 127, 143, 147, 172, 193, 301, 307, 308, 406, 428, 452, 453,
 457, 486.
 as to language of Catechism, 215, 218, 219.
 as to Real Presence, 240.
 as to figurative sense of *eating*, 275.
 as to *change* by consecration, 372, 373.
 as to ancient Liturgies, 377.
 as to phrase, "Real Presence," 396.

- Goodwin, quoted, for language like that of our Catechism, 212.
 Gorham, Reformation Gleanings, referred to, 299, 384, 436, 481.
 Goldburn, quoted, 275.
 referred to, 324, 350, 363.
 Grabe, quoted, 300.
 referred to, 302, 345, 535.
 Gregory de Valentia on Protestant Doctrine, 526, 527.
 Gregory, St., quoted, 157, 371, 372.
 Gregory XI., Pope, quoted, 3.
 Grindal, Archbishop, account of, 13.
 quoted, as to reception by wicked, 13.
 as to oral manducation, 13.
 as to reception by faith, 13.
 as to Christ's body, 14.
 as to Sacrament and Sacrifice, 14.
 as to change of Views due to Bullinger, 15.
 as to Spiritual mode of Presence and Reception in Eucharist—not
 left an open question in the English Church, 15, 16.
 as to Baptism by Women, 16.
 as to Guilt of unworthy Receiving, 101, 102.
 as to Elizabeth's restoration of Edward's Reformation, 105, 106.
 as to agreement with Helvetic Confession, 106.
 as to faith as mouth, 249.
 as to Luthero-Papistical Ministry, 428.
 as to word "taken," 495.
 as to teaching of St. Augustine, 515.
 Gropper, referred to, 353.
 Grueber, referred to, 63, 232, 284, 468, 469.
 Gualter writes (in conjunction with Bullinger) concerning false report of the
 doctrine and practice in the English Church, 15.
 referred to, 106, 466.
 Gunning, Dr. Peter, 550.
 Haddon, quoted, 392.
 Hall, *Fragmenta Liturgica*, referred to, 286.
 Hall, *Reliquiæ Liturgicæ*, referred to, 286, 314, 328.
 Hall, Harmony of Protestant Confessions, referred to, 106, 207.
 quoted, for language like the language of Catechism, 207, 209.
 Hall, Bishop, referred to, 200, 241, 242, 302, 328, 530, 536.
 quoted, as to reality of Spiritual reception, 216.
 as to relation to Christ's Death, 273.
 as to reception by faith only, 280.
 as to teaching of Prayer Book, 314, 321, 338, 339.
 as to words of delivery, 326.
 as to elevation, 333.
 as to sacrifice, 355, 370.
 as to adoration, 388.
 Hallam, quoted, as to doctrine of Overall's Convocation Book, 195.
 as to Rainolds, 199.
 as to Queen Elizabeth, 383.
 referred to, 198, 291, 428.
 Hammond, quoted, as to simplicity of Catechism, 187.
 as to God being the Giver of the *res Sacramenti*, 246, 247.
 as to organical Presence, 280.

- Hammond, quoted, as to relation of Prayer Book to Missal, etc., 336, 337, 340.
as to phrases, "Real Presence," "Corporal Presence," 393.
- Harding, referred to, 156.
quoted, 156, 157, 164, 165.
- Hardwick, on Articles, referred to, 12, 104, 105, 146.
- History of Reformation, referred to, 145, 462, 481.
quoted, 486.
as to Bishop Overall, 194.
as to revision of Prayer Book in Edward VI.'s reign, 340, 341.
- Harmonia Confessionum, quoted, 250, 263, 529.
- Harmony between Old and Present Nonconformists, 244.
- Harris, Claims of Priesthood, 365.
- Harrison, Archdeacon, on Rubrics, referred to, 345.
- Harrison, "Whose are the Fathers?" referred to, 195.
- Harrison, Joseph, as to the sense of the words of Catechism, 228.
- Heidelberg, see Catechism.
- Henry IV., King, quoted, 10.
- Herbert, G., referred to, 386.
- Heurtley, Dr., quoted, 302, 308, 379, 446, 447.
referred to, 328, 344, 399, 476.
- Hey, Professor, referred to, Lectures, 348.
- Heylyn, Antidotum Lincolnense, quoted, 316, 317, 382.
- History of Reformation, referred to, 127, 343, 383.
quoted, 428.
- Hickes, Dr. George, Treatises, quoted, 360.
referred to, 191, 298, 345, 353, 354, 366, 531, 532, 536.
- Hierome, see Jerome.
- Hilles, quoted, 293.
- Holy Table—Name and Thing, quoted as to Adoration, 388.
- Homilies—Their authority, 142.
The phrase in the Notice "Under the form of bread and wine," 142, 525
sqq.
One of them written by Bonner, 145.
quoted, as to Lord's Supper being no bare sign, 171.
as to being "guests and not gazers," 180.
as to "memory" not "sacrifice," 181, 182, 183.
as to "making Christ thine own," 181.
as to no need of "Sacrificing Priest," 181.
as to gross carnal feeding, 181.
as to "faithless cannot feed," 182.
as to receiving "not the shadow only but the Body," 182.
as to knowledge required for Lord's Supper, 187.
quotation from Emissenus, 205.
as to reality of reception and possession of the *res Sacramenti*,
220.
as to appropriating faith, 224.
as to illustration of Prayer of Humble Access, 328.
as to vestments, etc., 427.
- Hook, Dean of Chichester, referred to, 103, 111, 116, 145, 167, 291, 292, 341,
350.
- Hooker, account of, 87.
quoted, 10, 11, 20, 529.
as to Christ's human nature and ubiquity, 87, 88, 89.

- Hooker, quoted, as to mixture of substance of Christ's flesh with ours, 87, 89.
 as to the necessity of the Presence of Christ's body being definite and local, 89.
 as to absence of Christ's Body from Earth, 89.
 as to its Presence "after a sort," 89.
 as to the infinite merit and possibility of application of Christ's sacrificed body, 89.
 as to Presence in elements, 90.
 as to Consubstantiation and Transubstantiation, 90.
 as to corporal and oral manducation, 90.
 as to grace received from God and not from Sacraments, 91.
 as to Sacramental Efficacy not contained, 91, 464.
 as to Real Presence in Receiver, 91.
 as to Presbyters and Priests, 92, 93.
 as to Sacrifice, 92.
 as to Mingle-Mangle of religion and superstition, 93.
 as to elements being not bare signs, 177, 178, 462.
 as to Jewel, 206.
 as to acknowledgment that the *Efficacy* is not all that is received, 218.
 as to quickening power of Christ's flesh, 222.
 as to the *res Sacramenti* being received from a Divine Person, 245, 246.
 as to relation of Christ's Death, 272.
 as to Sacramental relation, 320.
 as to adoration, 387.
 as to Corporal Presence, 392.
 as to sense of word "Sacrament," 516, 537.
- Hooper, Bishop, account of, 52.
 quoted, as to the words "till He come," 28.
 as to Presence in, under, with, the elements, 53, 54.
 as to receiving verily and indeed the *res Sacramenti*, 53.
 as to spiritual reception by faith, 53.
 as to reception by wicked, 53.
 as to reception spiritually, 54.
 as to dynamical Presence, 54.
 as to the change by Consecration, 55.
 as to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 55.
 as to Sacramental Efficacy for body and soul, 56.
 as to presence and absence, 55.
 as to reception by wicked, 55, 56.
 as to doctrine of Luther, more erroneous than Papists, 56.
 as to guilt of unworthy reception, 101, 102.
 as to elements being not bare signs, 175, 176.
 uses language like that of the Catechism, 205, 206.
 as to real reception without the outward sign, 270.
 quoted also, 247, 257, 392.
 as to phrase "give grace," 462.
 as to *opus operatum*, 464.
 as to sense of "spiritually," 487.
 as to word "taken," 494.
 as to word "given," 495.
 as to teaching of St. Augustine, 514.

- Hooper, Bishop, referred to, 102, 104.
 his authority, 526-530.
- Hooper, Bishop George, quoted, 407.
 as to Adoration, 390.
 as to the Protestantism of the Church of England, 420.
- Horne, Bishop, writes (in conjunction with Grindal) to Bullinger concerning
 the doctrine and practice of the English Church, 15, 16, 428.
- Horne, Bishop, writes to Bullinger as to English having the same doctrine
 as Zurich, 106.
- Horneck, "Crucified Jesus," 466, 480.
- Horsley, Bishop, referred to, 347.
 quoted, 488.
- Hospinian, referred to, 220, 521.
 quoted as to consent between Calvin and Zwingli, 258-260.
 quoted also, 262, 263, 264, 269, 350, 442, 456, 478, 479, 480, 482, 487,
 488, 497, 499, 504, 507.
 as to Queen Elizabeth, 384.
 referred to, 324, 454.
- Humphry, referred to, 304, 345, 351.
 quoted, 313, 325.
- Husband, Rev. E., "Catholic Tracts," quoted, 4, 285, 321-323.
- Hutchinson, account of, 57.
 quoted as to reception, not in the bread, 57.
 as to reception by wicked, 57, 58.
 as to spiritual reception by faith and no other reception, 57.
 as to Sacrifice and Mass, 58, 59.
 as to Sacerdotium and Priest, 59.
 as to elevation and adoration, 59.
 as to guilt of not receiving, 102.
 as to receipt by faith only, 213.
 as to receipt from God, not from bread, 246.
 as to Sacramental conveyance, 267.
 as to real reception without the outward sign, 270.
 as to unworthy reception, 411.
 as to sense of "spiritually," 488.
- Hutton, Answers to Exceptions to Prayer Book, quoted, 200, 201, 233, 386.
- Hymnal, People's, quoted, 378.
- Ignatius, St., quoted, 61.
 referred to, 354.
- Innocent, Pope, quoted, 2.
- Innocent IV., quoted, 357.
- Jackson, Dean, quoted, 410, 537, 538.
 as to Christ's Human Nature, 222, 229, 245.
 as to faith being a mouth, 249.
 as to dynamical presence, 279, 528.
 as to his incautious language, 526, 539-543.
- Jacobson, Bishop, quoted, 119-121, 197, 198.
- James I., King, quoted, as to directions for framing addition to Catechism,
 231.
- Jenkyns, Rev. H., Preface to Cranmer's Works, quoted, 338, 343, 481,
 522.
- Jerome, St., quoted, 61.

- Jewel, account of (see Apology), 77, 78.
 quoted, as to Christ's Body being in the vessels, 30, 31.
 as to sense of Sacraments, 61.
 as to presence of Christ's Body in heaven only, 78, 79.
- Jewel, quoted as to manducation by faith only, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83.
 as to Presence "really," "corporally," "carnally," 78, 84.
 as to the use of the word "figure," 78.
 as to organical presence, 79.
 illustrated by Sun, 79.
 as to Sacraments covertly containing, 79.
 as to Union with Christ, 80.
 as to "the grace" being called "Christ's Body," 80.
 as to spiritual and oral reception, 80, 81.
 as to reception by wicked, 81, 82.
 as to eating "indeed and verily," but spiritually, 81, 214.
 as to holding by faith, 82.
 as to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 83.
 as to adoration, 83, 84, 85, 86.
 as to Christ's presence in the stall and on the altar, 84, 85.
 as to guilt of NOT receiving, 101.
 as to Ubiquitarian doctrine refused in England, 106.
 as to completeness of Reformation, 106.
 as to phrase "under the form," 156 sqq.
 as to phrase "by bread and wine," 164.
 as to elements being not bare signs, 176, 177, 206.
 as to difference between *verily* and *fleshly*, 213.
 as to representative Sacrifice, 238.
 as to faith being as hand and mouth, 249.
 as to real reception without the outward sign, 270.
 as to "very Body," 277.
 as to *grace* called *Body*, 278.
 as to meaning of "mysteries," 348.
 as to phrase "Real Presence," 391.
 as to teaching of St. Augustine, 458, 516.
 as to *opus operatum*, 463.
 as to sense of "spiritually," 487, 488.
 as to the word "taken," 494.
 as to word "given," 495.
 as to Cheney's Lutheranism, 507.
- Johnson, J., referred to, 373, 531, 532.
 quoted, as to adoration, 390.
- Jolly, Bishop, Christian Sacrifice, referred to, 343.
- Jonas, Justus, see Catechism, 184.
- Judgment, Final, in the case of Liddell v. Weston, 297.
- Keble, on Eucharistic Adoration, referred to, 183, 191, 231.
- Ken, referred to, 99, 528.
- Kennet, quoted, 195.
- Kettlewell, quoted, as to adoration, 387.
- Kimmel, "Monumenta fidei Ecclesiæ Orientalis," 466, 476.
- Kiss of Peace, see Cobb.
- Knollys, Sir Francis, 437.
- Knox, A., Remains, quotation from Bishop Overall referred to, 190, 191, 192.
- Kœcher, Bibliotheca Theol. Symb. et Catech., 466.

- Lake, Bishop, quoted as to Sacraments being an annexe to doctrine, 227.
 as to eating Christ's flesh as *broken*, 229.
 as to a Divine Person being the giver of the *res Sacramenti*, 246, 248.
 as to faith being as mouth, 249, 529.
 as to relation to Christ's Death, 273.
 as to "effectual signs," 465.
- Lamb, Historical account of Articles, referred to, 116.
 quoted, 429, 446, 447, 448, 450, 457.
- Laski, see A Lasco.
- Lathbury, History of Convocation, referred to, 188, 315.
 History of Non-Jurors, referred to, 466, 535, 536.
 History of Common Prayer, referred to, 316.
- Latimer influenced by Cranmer, 26, 39.
 account of, 37, 38.
 quoted as to spiritual presence, 38.
 as to Mass, 38, 39, 40, 41.
 as to spiritual eating, 39, 40.
 as to the giving of Christ's Body to the mind, 39.
 as to effects of Consecration, 40, 41.
 as to sacrificing and preaching, 40, 41.
 as to elements being not bare signs, 174.
 as to real reception without the outward sign, 270.
 as to phrases, "Real Presence," "Spiritual Presence," 392.
 as to synonymous use of "eat" and "receive," 470.
- L'Aroque, History of Eucharist, referred to, 276, 324, 333, 349, 427, 521.
 quoted as to Adoration, 381.
- Laud, Archbishop, referred to, 317, 345, 523.
 his views, 195, 196, 237, 239, 240.
 quoted as to phrase "Corporal Presence," 393.
 Conference with Fisher, quoted, 237, 238, 523.
 on Ridley and Cranmer, 523.
- Laurence, Archbishop (Cashel), referred to, 294, 330.
- Le Bas, Life of Cranmer, quoted, 331.
- Lee, Dr. F. G., quoted, 357.
- Leibnitz, System of Theology, quoted, 308.
- Leighton, Archbishop, quoted as to reception of *res Sacramenti*, 252.
- L'Estrange, "Alliance of Divine Offices," quoted, 199.
 as to meaning of North side, 315, 316.
 as to 2nd Book of Edward, 334.
 as to Black Rubric, 385.
 as to phrase, "Real Presence," 393.
- Letters, Original (Parker Soc.), quoted, 342.
- Ley, John, "Debate concerning English Liturgy," 243.
- Life of the 70th Archbishop of Canterbury, 439.
- Lingard, History of England, quoted, 383, 428.
- Littledale, Dr., referred to, 111.
 quoted, 3, 4.
- Little Prayer Book, 378.
- Liturgy, the English, Puritan works against, 241-244.
 difference between 1st and 2nd of Edward, 294-301.
- Liturgies of Edward VI. (Parker Soc.), referred to, 344.
- Llandaff, Bishop of, see Ollivant.
- Locke, on Understanding, quoted, 88.

- Lombard, quoted, 133.
Longley, Archbishop, quoted, 18, 44, 99, 299, 402.
Longuerue, on Bertram, 521.
Luther, referred to, 104.
 quoted, 99, 220, 269, 358, 465, 510.

Machyn's Diary, referred to, 436.
Machonochie, quoted, 2, 3, 63, 253, 308, 309.
Magdeburg centuries, 439.
Malan, Rev. S., referred to, 231, 354, 427.
 quoted as to relation to Christ's Death, 275.
 as to Priesthood, 364, 365.
 as to phrase, "Real Presence," 397.
Mann, Bishop, Exposition of Catechism, referred to, 204.
Mant, Bishop, referred to, 345.
Manuals, Sarum and York, 268.
Marriott, Rev. W. B., quoted, 352.
Martin, Archdeacon, quoted, 34, 88.
 referred to, 194.
Martyr, Peter, referred to, 102, 103, 104, 345.
 quoted, 18, 19, 425, 466, 477, 487, 491, 492, 493, 499, 503.
 as to the English Reformation in 1555, 461, 462.
 as to Concordia Witebergensis, 484.
Maskell, Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, quoted, 303, 377, 378.
 referred to, 324, 372.
Mason, F., on Foreign Ordinations, referred to, 195.
 Vindiciæ Eccles. Anglicanæ, quoted, 195, 196, 331, 332, 358.
Mayer, on Church Catechism, referred to, 204, 538.
 quoted, 250.
Medd, Rev. P. G., quoted, 206, 310, 373, 400.
 referred to, 317, 328, 343, 344.
Mede, quoted as to Oblations, 345.
 as to Sacrifice, 352, 354.
Melancthon, referred to, 104, 105, 393, 522, 524.
 quoted, as to Sacramental efficacy, 465.
 as to Lutheran doctrine, 511, 512.
Micronius, M., quoted, 263.
Middleburgh Prayer Book, 286, 324, 349.
Migne, *Patrolog.*, 333, 398.
Missal, see Sarum.
Montague, Dr., referred to, 199.
More, Sir Thomas, his "Dialogue," referred to, 23.
Morley, quoted, as to "Corporal Presence," 395.
Morlinus, 484.
Morning Exercise against Popery, 353, 362.
Morton, Bishop, quoted, 28, 161, 167, 168, 169, 245, 538.
 on the Receptionist view, 527.
 on "Sacramental" and "Real" Presence, 538.
 as to truth being in effectual virtue, 278, 279.
 as to elevation, 333.
 as to sacrifice, 360, 365, 366, 369, 370, 520.
 as to priesthood, 365, 366.
 as to adoration, 379.

- Morton, Bishop, quoted as to unworthy reception, 441, 442.
as to teaching of St. Augustine, 453.
as to phrases, "Real Presence," "Corporal Presence," 397, 520.
as to sense of spiritually, 488, 529.
- Mosheim, Eccles. History, referred to, 276, 480, 481.
- Motion, humbly presented to the consideration of Parliament, 242.
- Musculus, Wolfgang, quoted as to "giving and receiving," 500, 501.
- Myconius, Oswald, quoted, 356.
- Neal, History of Puritans, quoted, 21, 105, 111, 145, 149, 197, 199, 202, 209, 244, 426, 506.
referred to, 13, 116, 162, 188, 200, 201, 384.
- Neal, Rev. Dr., quoted, 314.
- Newin, Dr., quoted, 478.
quoted as to agreement between English and other Reformed Confessions, 265.
- Nicholls, Dr., quoted as to words of delivery, 325, 326.
- Nicholls, Dr., Notes on Common Prayer, referred to, 188, 202, 317, 528.
quoted as to Elevation, etc., 332.
- Nicholson, Bishop, quoted, 161, 162, 247, 528, 530, 538.
as to phrases "Real Presence," "Corporal Presence," 395.
- Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, 326, 405, 406, 479, 480, 483.
- Nonconformists, the old, touching Common Prayer, 243.
- Norris, Canon J. P., quoted, 494, 495.
- Nowell, see Catechism.
- O'Brien, Bishop, referred to, 397, 399.
- Œcolampadius, quoted, 254, 262, 466, 467, 492, 493, 500, 503, 504.
Cranmer's opinion of, 524.
referred to, 522.
alleged by Papists to have forged Bertram's Book, 520.
- Œpinus, referred to, 6.
- Ollivant, Bishop (Llandaff), referred to, 191, 345.
quoted, 183.
as to Overall's words, 192, 193.
as to how we may be said to *give*, 214.
as to views of Cosin, 237, 238.
as to adoration, 382.
as to sense of "take," 488.
- Ordinal, 357.
of Sarum, 357.
- Origen, quoted, 82.
referred to, 83, 84.
- Osiander, quoted, 362, 363.
- Overall, Bishop, the writer of additions to Catechism, 190.
his doctrinal views, 190-197, 264.
his letter to Grotius, 190, 191.
Additional Notes (Nicholls's) attributed to him in error, 190, 191.
his words quoted by Knox, 190, 191.
MS. in which the words are found, 192, 193.
his Preface to Jewel's Works (1609), 194.
Whitgift's caution concerning him, 194.
his violation of Rubric, 194.

- Owen, J., quoted, 164.
 for language like that of our Catechism, 210, 211.
 as to phrases, "Real Presence," "Corporeal Presence," 394.
- Palmer, Origines Liturgicæ, referred to, 324, 336.
 quoted, 377.
- Papers, Present Day, 350.
- Parker, Archbishop, account of, 12.
 quoted, 12, 19, 462.
 referred to, 113.
 vindicated, 425-445.
- Parkhurst, Letter to J. Simler as to English rejecting Ubiquity, 106.
- Parkhurst, Lexicon, quoted as to sense of *mystery*, 348.
- Parry, Bishop, referred to, 225.
- Parsons, quoted, 383.
- Patrick, J., referred to, 454, 455.
- Patrick, Bishop, quoted, 162, 163, 183, 184, 528.
 as to meaning of Catechism, 223.
 as to relation to Christ's *Death*, 273, 274.
 as to Missal, 303.
 as to oblation, 354, 355.
 referred to, 345.
- Pearson, Bishop, referred to, 358.
- Perry, Rev. T. W., Declaration on Kneeling, quoted, 307.
 referred to, 310, 389, 428, 449, 452, 551.
- Perry, Rev. G. G., History of the Church of England, referred to, 199, 316.
 quoted, 244.
- Phillimore, Sir Robert, Judgment on the Real Objective Presence, 519.
- Philpot, account of, 45.
 as to limits of Christ's body, 45.
 as to Church of Geneva, 45.
 as to the plea of God's Omnipotence, 45.
 as to Real Presence to receiver, 45, 46, 47.
 as to Essential Presence, 46.
 as to reception by wicked, 47, 473.
 as to word "altar," 47.
 as to phrases "Essential Presence," "Real Presence," 392.
 as to synonymous use of "eat" and "receive," 470.
 as to teaching of St. Augustine, 514.
- Pilkington, account of, 93.
 quoted as to reception by faith, 94.
 as to word "altar," 94.
- Poinet, see Ponet.
- Ponet, account of, 41.
- Ponet, quoted as to the mouth of belief, 41.
 as to Sacramental eating, 42.
 as to the eating of unbelievers, 42.
 as to limits of Christ's Body, 42.
 as to presence to faith, 43.
 not the author of the *Diallacticon*, 43.
 the probable author of Edward VI.'s Catechism, 116.
- Potter, Archbishop, quoted as to Sacrifice, 370.
- Powell, Vavasor, 243.

- Poynet, see Ponet.
- Prayer Book (Common), no Divine Service, by Vavasor Powell, 243.
 Unmasked, 243.
 Devotions, Episcopal delusions, 243.
 Interleaved, 345.
- Principles at Stake, 111, 303, 304, 313, 315.
 quoted as to Consecration Prayer, 300, 377.
 as to words of Delivery, 325.
 as to elevation, 332.
 as to rejection of the word "spiritually" in our Article xxix., 468.
 as to Geste, 505.
- Procter, on Common Prayer, quoted as to the sanction of addition to Catechism, 189.
 as to the doctrinal alteration in Edward VI.'s 2nd Book, 293.
 referred to, 202, 341.
- Prosper, Sentences of, 58, 457.
- Prynne—Short, Sober, Pacific Examination, 242.
- Puller, Moderation of Church of England, quoted, 364.
- Puritanism, English (Bradshaw), 244.
- Pusey, Dr., quoted, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 62, 84, 85, 167, 206, 310, 408, 417, 428, 496.
 referred to, 143, 145, 154, 166, 172, 276, 277, 310, 321, 411.
- Queres concerning the book of Common Prayer, 242.
- Rabanus Maurus, quoted, 80.
- Rainolds (or Reynolds), Dr., referred to, 33, 197, 198, 199, 303.
 quoted, 353, 355, 364.
- Randolph, Bishop, quoted, 116, 126.
- Ratramn, see Bertram.
- Redmayne, Dr., quoted as to reception by wicked, 424, 441.
- Reformatio Legum, account of, 112, 113.
 how far a book of "Sanction," 113.
 quoted as to Ubiquity, 113, 114.
 as to elevation, reservation, and adoration, 114.
 as to reception by wicked, 114.
 as to Presence in or under elements, 114.
 as to Real Presence, 115.
 as to sacrifice and priesthood, 115.
 as to elevation, reservation, and adoration, 333.
 approved by Parker, 430.
- Reformation Gleanings, see Gorham.
- Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, 314, 551.
- Renaudot, quoted, 271.
 as to breaking of bread, 324.
 as to age of Liturgies, 365.
 as to simplicity of ancient Service, 372.
 as to Invocation of Holy Spirit, 376, 377.
- Repetitio Anhaltina, 479.
- Resolution of case of Conscience, quoted, 386.
- Reynolds, Dr., see Rainolds.
- Reynolds, Bishop, quoted as to relation to Christ's Death, 273.
 as to dynamical Presence, 280.
 as to Presence in elements, 319.

- Reynolds, Bishop, quoted as to phrases "Real Presence," "Corporal Presence," "Spiritual Presence," 395.
- Review, Dublin, quoted as to agreement of Cranmer and the Catechism, 205.
as to consistency of Articles and Catechism, 233.
as to Black Rubric, 309.
as to adoration of Rome, 398.
- Richardson, Lecture on Ritualism, referred to, 28.
- Ridley, Gloucester, quoted, 330, 522, 523.
- Ridley, Bp. Nicholas (Rochester, London), referred to, 3.
account of, 26.
his influence with Cranmer, 26, 523.
quoted as to Corporal Presence, 27.
as to Sacramental "grace annexed," not "included," 27; promised
and given not to the elements, but to worthy receivers, 27.
as to Presence by spirit and Grace, 27, 28, 34, 35.
as to the force of the words "Until He come," 28.
as to figurative sense of the words "This is my Body," 29, 37, 522,
523.
as to Christ leaving His flesh, not in substance, but in mystery, and
by grace, 32.
as to Christ's Body received by hearing the Gospel and by faith,
29.
as to Christ's Body being given as well in the word as also on the
Cross, 30.
as to worshipping Christ in the Sacrament, 30, 32, 33, 34.
as to how Bread is called Christ's Body, 30, 37.
as to the Blood being in the Chalice, 30, 31.
as to what evil men eat, 31, 34, 523.
as to the Lamb lying on the Table, 31, 32.
as to ambiguity of "really" present, 32; and "Real Presence," 33.
as to the limits of Christ's Body, 33, 34.
as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, 35.
as to "form of a Table," Lord's board, and altar, 35, 36.
as to the Church of England, 37.
perused Bradford's Sermons, 48.
explanation of his language, 60, 61.
as to agreement in England against Lutheranism, 104, 105.
perused Catechism of Edward VI., 116.
as to phrase "Under the forms of bread and wine," 154, 155, 156.
as to elements being not bare signs, 173, 174.
as to Christ being Himself the giver of the *res Sacramenti*, 245.
as to real reception without the outward sign, 270.
as to grace called flesh, 278.
as to phrases "Real Presence," 391; "Corporal Presence," 392.
as to *opus operatum*, 464.
as to word "taken," 494.
as to teaching of St. Augustine, 513, 523.
his estimation of Parker, 436.
his views of the Sacrifice, 328.
referred to, 94, 154, 291.
- Rivet, quoted, 364.
- Rivington, Rev. L., quoted, 253.
referred to, 383.

- Robertson, Canon, "How shall we conform?" referred to, 188, 315, 345.
 quoted, 375, 376.
- Rogers, account of, 94.
 quoted as to reception by faith as by hands and mouth of soul, 95.
 as to Synusiasts or Ubiquitaries, 95.
 as to Corporal reception, 95.
 as to reception by wicked, 95.
 as to mass and sacrifice, 95, 96.
 as to adoration, 96.
 as to faith being as hand and mouth, 248.
 as to reception by wicked, 421.
 as to agreement in England on the doctrine of the Eucharist, 434.
 as to Sacramental efficacy, 467.
 referred to, 463.
- Rupertus, quoted, 372.
- Saddler, Rev. M. F., quoted, 337, 343, 346, 358, 427.
- Salisbury, Bishop of, the late, 253.
- Salmeron, referred to, 360.
- Sancroft, Archbishop, quoted, as to the errors of the Church of Rome, 240.
 referred to, 373.
- Sancta Clara, quoted, 452.
- Sanders, quoted, 383, 384.
- Sandys, account of, 96.
 quoted, as to reception by wicked, 96.
 as to Christ's body being local, 97.
 as to the Sacrament being a figure effectual, 97.
 as to seeing, touching, digesting by faith, 97, 249.
 as to sense of words "This is My Body," 97.
 as to seal and letters patent, 97.
 as to effectual offer, 101.
 as to reality of spiritual possession, 221.
 as to real reception without the outward sign, 271.
 as to effectual signs, 408.
 as to sense of "spiritually," 488.
 referred to, 429.
- Saravia, quoted, 3, 443.
 referred to, 443, 529, 535, 536.
- Sarpi, History of the Council of Trent, referred to, 6, 463.
 quoted, 359.
- Sarum Manual, 268, 333, 357, 400, 520.
- Saxon Theologians, the, of 1530, 520.
- Scott, Bishop, 370, 371.
- Scotus Erigena, 521.
- Scudamore, Rev. W., "North Side," quoted, 318.
- Search after cause of God's Wrath, 242.
- Seckendorf, Historia Lutheranismi, quoted, 210, 475, 476, 496, 497.
- Secker, Archbishop, on the Words of the Catechism, 219.
 as to real and dynamical Presence, 281.
 as to mystery, 349.
 as to adoration, 387.
- Service Book no better than a Mess of Pottage, 244.
- Seymour, Rev. H., referred to, 315.

- Sharp, Archbishop, as to reality of reception, 220.
 as to Real Presence, 248, 281.
 as to spiritual benefits, 278.
 as to sacrifice, 346, 347, 361, 367.
 as to 1st Book of Edward VI., 346, 347.
 as to adoration, 381, 397, 398.
- Sheldon, Bishop, quoted, as to phrase, "Real Presence," 395.
- Sherlock, quoted, 165.
- Shipley, Rev. O., quoted, 298, 310, 332, 347, 399.
- Sibbes, quoted, 183.
 as to reality of spiritual, *taking* and possession, 221, 225.
- Sidonius, referred to, 353.
- Six Articles, The, 531.
- Smalkaldic Articles, 477.
- Smalkaldic League, the, 105.
- Smectymnus, 241, 242.
- Smith, H., quoted for language like that of Catechism, 212, 213.
- Soames, Elizabethan History, referred to, 13, 105, 188, 197.
 quoted, 198, 429.
 History of Reformation, quoted, 293, 329, 330.
 referred to, 145, 341, 428.
- Southey's Book of the Church, quoted, 231.
- Sparks, Dr., converted from Nonconformity, 199.
- Stillingfleet, referred to, 3, 142.
- Stoffelius, 484.
- Stowell, Canon, quoted, as to relation of Prayer Book to Missal, etc., 339.
- Strype, quoted, 19, 102, 103, 112, 113, 127, 149, 335, 336, 384, 430, 431, 432,
 433, 434, 440, 443, 444, 447, 448.
 referred to, 105, 106, 194, 428.
- Stuart, "Thoughts on Low Masses," referred to, 4.
 quoted, 4, 166, 297.
 "Mediation of the Church," quoted, 4.
- Suarez, referred to, 353.
- Sumner, Rev. G. H., quoted, 505.
- Survey of Book of Common Prayer, referred to, 202.
 quoted, 241.
- Swainson's Essay on Article 29, referred to, 441.
- Swinnoek, quoted, 98, 99, 214, 250.
- Syngamma Suevicum, 263, 480.
- Syntagma Thesium Theol. in Academia Salmuriensi disp. etc., quoted, 310,
 352.
- Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, quoted, 11, 62, 86, 88, 158, 184, 313, 358, 359, 411,
 521, 527.
 as to teaching of Catechism, 204.
 as to manducation by faith, 216, 229.
 as to eating Christ's flesh as crucified, 229.
 as to effectual signs, 408.
 as to Liturgy, 311, 312, 334, 335, 337, 338, 340.
 as to phrase "Real Presence," 158, 392, 393.
 as to teaching of St. Augustine, 454.
 on the Receptionist View, 527.
 referred to, 6, 11, 326.

- Taylor, Rev. S., referred to, 206, 505.
 quoted, 486, 487.
- Tertullian, referred to, 78, 381.
- Thirlwall, Bishop (St. David's), Charges, referred to, 310, 315, 399.
 quoted, 313, 314, 350, 363, 364, 367, 368, 427.
- Thorn, see Declaratio.
- Thorndike, Herbert, quoted, as to the words "to us," 344, 345.
 as to sacrifice, 362, 535.
 his views, 469, 527, 538, 543-548.
 on Ubiquitarians, 546.
- Thorpe, William, quoted, 159.
- Thoruniensis, see Declaratio.
- Tillotson, Archbishop, quoted, as to Sacramental Conveyance, 267.
- Toplady, quoted, as to relation of Prayer Book to Missal, etc., 339, 340.
- Torgau, Articles of, 485.
- Tracts for the Times, referred to, 307, 313.
- Tracts for the Day, quoted, 2, 5, 62, 85, 87, 253.
 referred to, 3, 11.
- Traheron, Letter of, quoted, 103, 104.
- Trevor, Canon, quoted, 86.
 referred to, 170, 331, 345, 365.
- Trial of the English Liturgy, 242.
- Truths for the Times, 297.
- Turrian, 521.
- Tyndale, account of, 23.
 quoted, as to meaning of eating Christ's Flesh, 24.
 as to Christ's Body not present under the form of bread, 24; not so
 eaten, 25.
 as to the sense in which the Eucharist is called by the doctors a
 Sacrifice, 25.
 as to the word *Priest*, *Presbyter*, etc., 25.
 as to Lutherans and Papists, 50.
 as to adoration, 85.
 as to elements being not bare signs, 172.
 as to real reception without the outward sign, 269.
 as to sacrifice, 359.
 referred to, 145.
- Ursinus, Z., quoted, 463.
 as to Sacramental analogy, 250.
 as to reception of substance and essence, 261.
 as to Presence in Sacrament, 320.
 as to breaking of bread, 324.
 as to sense of *mystery*, 349.
 as to phrases "Spiritual Presence," "Corporal Presence," etc., 394.
 as to adoration, 398.
 as to participation, 418.
 as to "heavenly manner," 449, 489.
 as to reception by unbelievers, 477, 478.
 as to sense of "spiritually," 487.
 as to reception of *res Sacramenti*, 490, 491.
 as to "eating," 492.
 as to Augsburg Confession, 496.

- Ursinus, Z., quoted as to phrase "under the form," 496.
 as to giving and receiving, 500.
 as to force of "Institution," 502.
- Ussher, Archbishop, quoted, 86, 193.
 as to reception of the *res Sacramenti*, 221, 222.
 as to conjunction altogether spiritual, 226.
 as to spiritual hunger and eating, 228.
 as to comparison with letters patent, 266.
 as to reception of "that very thing" spoken of in John vi., 278.
- Wagner, Rev. A. D., referred to, 4.
- Wake, Archbishop, referred to, 142, 158, 210, 238, 281, 349.
 quoted, 266, 285, 286, 306, 311, 334, 337, 383, 393, 528, 529, 548.
- Walcott, on English Ordinal, referred to, 357.
- Walton, Isaac, Life of Sanderson, quoted, 376.
- Walton, H. B., Rubrical Determination, referred to, 523, 549.
- Warburton, Bishop, quoted, as to words of Institution, 502.
- Ward, Dr., quoted, 462, 463.
- Waterland, quoted, 18, 163, 164, 218, 225, 226, 245, 246, 266, 274, 275, 281,
 312, 345, 402, 403, 411, 529.
 as to Prayer of Humble Access, 327.
 as to Invocation of the Holy Spirit, 377.
 as to Real Presence, 396, 529, 535.
 referred to, 238.
 on the sense of "local," 535, 541.
- Westcott, "History of the English Bible," referred to, 145.
- Westminster Assembly's Catechism, quoted, 211, 212.
- Westminster Assembly's Directory, quoted, 286, 323, 346. See Confession.
- Wheatly on Common Prayer, referred to, 188.
 quoted, 197.
 as to North side, 317.
 as to breaking of the Bread, 323, 324.
- Whately, Archbishop, see Cautions for the Times.
- Whitaker, referred to, 76, 348.
- Whitgift, Archbishop, Letter to Parker, 13.
 account of, 16.
 as to Real Presence, 16, 18, 19, 197, 530.
 as to Consubstantiation, 17.
 as to the word "Priest," 17.
 as to the Church of England reformed, 19.
 as to Overall, 194.
 as to effectual signs, 408.
 as to adoration, 389.
- Wicelius, referred to, 353.
- Wilberforce, Archdeacon, quoted, 298.
- Willet, account of, 97, 98.
 quoted, as to reception by wicked, 98.
 as to reception by faith, 98.
 as to sacrifice, 98.
 as to expression "Sub Sacramento," 158.
 as to elements being not bare signs, 178.
 as to "exhibitive" signs, 193, 194.
 as to Prayer of Humble Access, 327.

578 *Index of Authors and Books Quoted and Referred to.*

Willet, quoted, as to *opus operatum*, 464, 465.
referred to, 463.

Williams, Bishop, see Holy Table.
Orthodox and Non-jurors, 536.

Womock, see "Beaten Oil."

Woodhead, quoted, 311, 521.

Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses, quoted, as to Bishop Overall and Fr. Mason, 195.
as to Rainolds, 199.
as to Cheney, 432.

Wordsworth, Bishop, Greek Testament, quoted, as to meaning of "Mysteries,"
348.
as to word "taken," 494.

Wren, Bishop, 315.

York Manual, 268.

Young, quoted, 424.

Zaccharia, Bibliotheca Ritualis, quoted, 365.
referred to, 372.

Zanchius, H., quoted, as to faith being as hand and mouth, 249, 250.
as to reception by wicked, 474.
as to testing question, 474.
as to Augsburg Confession, 499.

Zwingle, quoted, 193, 355, 356, 493.
referred to, 324.

Zwinglians at Marburg, 210.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

Act of Uniformity, Queen Elizabeth, referred to, 22, 188, 189.

Charles II., referred to, 22.

Adoration, 3, 59, 68, 71, 74, 77, 83, 84-87, 96, 305-311, 332, 333, 378-382, 385-399.

Altar, 17, 18, 35, 36, 47, 66, 68, 94, 296, 297, 351.

Analogy, Sacramental, 216, 217, 250-253.

Anglo-Louvain Calumniators, 16.

Application, 347, 511, 512.

Articles of the Church of England, 253, 254, 255.

Baptism, 124.

Baptism by Women, 16.

Bell, Sacrying, 35.

Body of Christ, Limitations of, 33, 34, 42, 43, 44, 45, 87, 89, 96, 97, 113, 114, 117, 118, 122, 125, 127, 133, 135, 136.

Infinite Merit of, 89.

Body, Sacramental efficacy pertaining to (as well as to soul), 55.

Bread, Breaking of, 323, 324, 353.

Bread-offering, 345.

Burleigh, Lord, 440.

Canon, 79, 121, 122.

Canon 80, 189.

Canons of 1571, 149.

Canons of 1640, 351.

Cheney, Bishop, 445 sqq.

Church of England, False report of her doctrine and practice as to the Eucharist, 15, 16.

Concordia Witebergensis, 481.

Conference at Hampton Court, 33, 188, 197, 198, 199.

Conference at the Savoy, 187, 211, 548-551.

Confession, Helvetic, 106.

Consecration, the Change resulting, 55.

Consecration Prayer, 299-301, 371-373.

Consubstantiation, 5, 6, 89, 90.

Conveyance, Deed of, 167, 168, 169, 227, 266, 267.

Council of Nice, 181.

Count Palatine, 56.

Crucifix in Queen Elizabeth's Chapel, 436, 437.

Death of Christ, Relation of Eucharist to it, 227, 271-275.

Declaration of Twenty-one Priests, 351, 352.

- Distinction between Christ's Body and the grace of the body, 51.
 Dort, Synod of, 209, 462.
- Effectual, see Sacraments.
- Elevation, 59, 332, 333, 385.
- Elizabeth, Queen, the Reformation in her reign, 22, 149, 382-385, 426, 436, 437.
- Episcopacy, Divine right of, 195.
- Exhibitive, see Sacraments.
- Exhortation in Communion Service, 284, 285, 321.
- Faith, the soul's mouth, 65, 80, 95, 97, 118, 124, 248, 249, 250, 540.
 the soul's hand, 82, 95, 97, 182, 248, 249, 250.
- Faithful, meaning of, 231-235.
- Faithful only receive the *res Sacramenti*, 125.
- Fathers, the ancient, their doctrine, 18.
- Form of Bread and Wine (see Reception and Presence), 142 sqq., 147, 525.
- Geneva, Church of (Philpot), 45.
- Geste, Bishop, 445 sqq.
- Giver, the, of the *res Sacramenti*, a Divine Person, 244-248, 498, 499.
- Grace, in relation to Sacraments, 27 (Ridley).
 received from God, not from Sacraments, 91.
- Hampton Court Conference, 16.
- Heaven, Faith must ascend thither to eat, 54, 69, 70, 78, 79.
- Human Nature, see Nature.
- Humble Access, Prayer of, 286.
- Impanation, 85, 370.
- Institution, sense of the words of, 4, 73, 97, 135, 502 sqq.
- Instruments, see Sacraments.
- Invocation of Holy Spirit on elements, 376-378.
- Kneeling at Communion, 386 sqq.
- Language, Inconclusiveness of, untested, 98, 99.
 of our Reformers and our Formularies, 107-110.
- Lease, 267.
- Letters Patent, 97, 266.
- Lights on the Lord's Board, 35.
- Liturgy, the English, opinions of, 399-401.
- Lutheranism, 5, 6, 20, 49, 56, 90.
 in England, 102-106, 110.
- Magdeburg Centuries, 439.
- Manducation by faith, 13, 14, 41, 42, 49, 65, 68, 74, 78, 80.
 Oral, 9, 13, 39, 65, 68, 69, 70-80, 90.
 Sacramental, 42.
 Spiritual, 13, 14, 39, 40, 42, 54, 55, 68, 69.
- Marburg, Conference of, 210.
- Mass, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 51, 52, 55, 58, 59, 65, 71, 72, 74, 75, 94, 95, 96,
 115, 166, 167, 181, 298, 302, 350, 351.
- Massing Priests, 93, 543.

Melchizedec, 75, 543.

Mingle-Mangle, 93.

Missal, 303.

Mysteries, 347-350.

Nature of Christ, Human (see Body), 88, 89, 222.

North Side, 316.

Objective Presence, see Presence.

Oblation, see Sacrifice.

Oblation, Prayer of, 366, 367.

Ecclampadius, 20, 49.

Offer of grace in Sacraments, 101.

Omnipotence of God pleaded for error, 45, 88, 89.

Opus Operatum, 463, 464.

Ordinal, 356 sqq.

Oyster Table, 36.

Papists, 90.

Peucer, 479.

Poissy, Colloquy of, 210.

Presbyter, see Priest.

Presence, Corporal, 7, 10, 26, 27, 28 (Ridley), 49, 50, 51, 52, 76, 77, 78, 83, 84, 89, 136, 167, 168, 237, 238, 391-397.

in or under the form of Bread and Wine, 24, 25, 28, 34, 37, 38, 49, 52, 53, 56, 57, 70, 71, 88, 90, 114, 134, 147, 150, 155, 159, 160, 228, 237.

Dynamical, 43, 44, 54, 69, 70, 79, 89, 90, 278, 279, 280, 281.

Essential, 46.

Local and supra-local, 88, 97.

Organical, 32, 89, 237, 277, 309.

Spiritual, 38 (Latimer), 45 (Philpot), 76.

by Spirit and grace, 27 (Ridley), 45 (Philpot).

to faith, 43, 48, 49, 76, 117.

Substantial, 209, 218, 222, 261, 262, 263, 265, 277.

Real, 1, 11, 18, 19, 28, 30 (Ridley), 31 (Jewel), 33 (Ridley), 38 (Latimer), 45, 46 (Philpot), 51 (Bradford), 70, 78, 83, 91, 102, 114, 136, 155, 185, 237, 238, 240, 248, 281, 391-397.

Real Objective, 1-5, 16-19, 519.

of a Body, after the manner of Spirit, 6, 10, 11, 135.

Sacramental, *i.e.* not *real*, 60-63, 538.

Priest, 25, 59, 75, 76, 92, 93, 115, 129, 138, 139, 181, 361, 362.

Propitiatory, 65, 76, 95.

Puritans, 197, 198, 203, 426, 427, 533.

Real Presence, see Presence.

Reception "under the form of bread and wine," 142, 148, 185.

Spiritual, by faith, 53, 57, 68, 82, 83, 94, 95, 96, 98, 123, 124, 128, 137.

by the wicked, without faith, 8, 9, 13, 42, 47, 48, 51, 53, 56, 57, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 77, 81, 82, 95, 96, 98, 114, 129, 133, 137.

its guilt, 101, 102.

Receptionist view, the, 526, 527.

Refugees, English, 104.

Review, the last, of the Prayer Book, 373-376.

- Ritualism, effects of, 322, 323.
 Rubric, as to covering with fair linen cloth, 33.
 as to extremity of sickness, 267, 268, 520.
 Black, 305 sqq., 309, 389-397, 526, 531, 532, 548, 549, 550.
- Sacraments, Grace annexed to, 27 (Ridley); not included, 27, 91.
 moral instruments, 91.
 effectual signs, 96, 123, 124, 408, 461 sqq.
 exhibitive signs, 205.
 not bare signs, 171-179.
- Sacramental, sense of, 60-62, 148, 155, 512 sqq.
- Sacrifice in Eucharist, 4, 17, 18, 25, 35, 40, 41, 52, 55, 59, 65, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 83, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 115, 125, 138, 181, 183, 238, 296, 353-355, 357-364, 368-370.
- Seals, illustrating Sacramental efficacy, 53, 97, 102, 123, 161, 162, 167, 168, 180, 266, 267.
- Side, North, 315-318.
- Signs, effectual, see Sacraments.
- Substance of Christ's flesh not mixed with ours, 87, 89, 90.
- Sun, used to illustrate Spiritual Presence, 35 (Ridley), 44, 79, 117, 122, 163.
- Synod of Dort, see Dort.
- Synusiasts, 95.
- Traditions, 93.
- Transubstantiation, 5, 16, 49, 50, 51, 52, 77, 90, 541.
- Trent, Council of, 18, 355, 363, 367, 548.
- Ubiquitaries, 95, 103.
- Ubiquity, 70, 106, 136.
- Union, Sacramental, 132.
- Vestments, controversy concerning, 22, 106, 426, 427.
- Will with conveyance (Wake), 266.
- Worship, sense of, 33.
 of the Sacrament, 30, 32, 33.
- Zwingle's Views, 19, 20, 49.

A 050293.2
 THEOLOGY LIBRARY
 CLAREMONT, CALIF.

Bx

5149

C5

D56

1911

V.2

**THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT**

CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

91711

A050293.2

